

S T R I C T U R E S
U P O N
P R I M I T I V E C H R I S T I A N I T Y,

B Y
T H E R E V. D R. K N O W L E S,
P R E B E N D A R Y O F E L Y;

A S A L S O
U P O N T H E T H E O L O G I C A L A N D P O L E M I C A L
W R I T I N G S O F T H E
R T. R E V. T H E L O R D B I S H O P O F S T. D A V I D ' S.
T H E R E V. D R. P R I E S T L E Y,

A N D
T H E L A T E R E V. M R. B A D C O C K.
B Y J A M E S E D W A R D H A M I L T O N, E s q ;
P A R T T H E F I R S T. *K*

Da igitur veniam, pie lector, si aut minus oratio luculenta, aut verborum ubicunque præsumptorum novitas, aurem forte perculerit: elegi obrectatorum linguis magis exponi, quam a veritate sensuum experimenda, ubi omne est de falsitate periculum, longius aberrare. Marius Mercator. præf. in varios sermones impii Nestorii.

L O N D O N :
P R I N T E D F O R T H E A U T H O R, A N D S O L D B Y
J. J O H N S O N, S T. P A U L ' S C H U R C H Y A R D.
M. D C C. X C.

247
17



P R E F A C E.

THE object of the following sheets, as also of a harmony of the Evangelists, which I am preparing to lay before the public, is to shew that Jesus was not the Messiah or Christ; and that those writings which go under the appellation of the New Testament are spurious or adulterated: and have no pretensions whatever to be entitled the *Word of God*: and that Christianity in every form, as being founded upon these writings, is a sophistication of the religion taught by Jesus and his messengers. This is my object: and I trust at the conclusion it will clearly appear from the only evidence which in such extraordinary cases should be admitted, that both Moses and Jesus were persons extraordinarily commissioned by the Deity to declare his will, the first to the Hebrews, and the latter by his apostles to the Gentiles.

In taking up my pen against the very learned and ingenious Gentlemen mentioned in my title page, I am neither influenced by vanity nor ambition: being thoroughly conscious of the weakness of my natural abilities: and as to acquired knowledge I cannot boast of more than what usually falls to the lot of the liberally educated: so that if, in the following discussion, I should appear to have any advantage over each, or any, of them, the reader is solely to impute it to my having hit upon the True Theory, and not to superior sagacity. I do not intend by saying this, that I made the discovery by chance; the fact is far otherwise.

When it is considered, that the Gentlemen whom I propose animadverting upon, are highly celebrated for their abilities, both natural and acquired; and that each of them, in their very different lines, is held by his admirers to equal any of his predecessors, who entertained the same opinions, it must be deemed, should I succeed in my attempt, a forcible argument against the soundness of *their* theories, and of an approximation, at least, of *mine* towards the truth.

I will

I will not detain the reader longer with what may be deemed irrelevant matter; but, should he happen to be unconversant in studies of this nature, it will be incumbent upon him at times to recollect what immediately follows.

The ancient heathen philosophers held that man was composed of three principles: *body*—an *animating* or *living principle*, called by the Greeks *Psyche*, by the Latins *Anima*, which made the body a living body—and of an *intelligent principle*, called by the Greeks *Nous*, and by the Latins *Animus*, and *Mens*.

Of the Gnostics—that some held that Jesus was a mere man *like*, or begotten as, other men, under the guidance of a superior intelligent being, which they called the *Christ*.—Some, that Jesus was a Phantom, having no real body but the semblance of one; and of course that Jesus Christ resembled the vulgar idea of ghost and goblins.—Some*, that his body was *real*, but made by *the Christ* in the superior regions for an habitation before he descended in full manhood upon earth. The Catholics held, that Jesus Christ was the

* ~~He~~ *Apelles*.

result

result of—*body* miraculously begotten, though derived from Mary—the *Anima*—and the *Word* or God-Word: affirming as they still do, that the Word, *was, is, and always will be, God—Self-independent—Self-existent—and Self subsistent.*

Until the middle of the 4th century it had not been determined by the catholics that the *nous* composed a part of Jesus Christ, the Church wisely avoiding to commit itself by determining at any time, at least for 700 years, an iota beyond what was necessary at the moment; and when the moderns make mention of the variation of the Catholic Church, respecting its dogmas, they only exhibit a clear proof of their not understanding what the fathers have written; for that the Church never *contradicted* itself during that space of time, will be clearly evident from the second part of this work. Besides, can it reasonably be supposed, that a sect which changed it's opinions every day, or almost at every general council, according to the moderns, should acquire the mastery over all other sects. The notion is absurd.

I will now lay before the reader what strikes me to accord with the common sense of mankind

kind with regard to the evidence necessary to establish the certainty of *special interpositions* of the Deity.

First, I apprehend, that *if* the Deity has at any time more than ordinarily interfered in the concerns of man, that *at the time* there must have appeared proofs of it of *such a nature*, as to preclude every doubt of the reality. For the Deity to miraculously [out of the ordinary course of nature] interfere in human concerns, and with the view that mankind should be fully apprized of such special interference, and yet that mankind should be insensible of it, would argue, that the Deity *specially energized himself*, when he foreknew, that it would *not* be attended with the designed effect: which to affirm is absurd, if not impious.

2dly, I apprehend, that if the Deity has ever interposed, &c. that the *proofs* of such interposition, if intended to regulate the moral conduct of future generations, must be of *such a nature* as to command the assent of every reasonable person when fairly laid before him. Human testimony, however, I hold to be utterly inadequate in this respect, as at the most it can
only

only command our assent with regard to ordinary events. No one doubts that Vespasian was at Alexandria: but no one believes that he performed a miracle there; though both are recorded by the most judicious of the ancient historians *.

3dly, That *if* the Deity has revealed his Will to mankind by Moses, and Jesus, for the regulation of our moral conduct, the code must be apportioned to the faculties, and nature, of man: that is, it must not exceed the ordinary capacity of man to attain to a perfect knowledge of it; and this without at all affecting the ordinary pursuits of life. Our attention to these is so universal, and so attractive, that it may be well deemed a natural instinct; and therefore impossible to be sacrificed, except by a few individuals, to future prospects, however alluring. If the code exceeds this measure, it will be either in general neglected, which would argue that the Deity *idly exerted himself* for man, when he must have foreknown that man, in general, would give himself but little trouble about his ordinances: or otherwise, there must be an order of priests establish-

* Tacitus.

ed for teaching, expounding, &c. his bulky code. But this would be, as all history shews, the sacrificing the majority to the selfishness of a few; and the receiving our religion from man, though God had energized himself to give us a pure religion, and has even proscribed by Moses, and Jesus, our receiving one from man. To say that such priests would never act contrary to their trust is idle, even though history did not inform us of its fallacy: for the great end of a REVEALED religion is the EVER PRESENT conviction of its *having been* divinely revealed: now, when man receives his religion from priests, no matter whether pure or otherwise, this conviction will gradually diminish, and at last cease to be *ever present*, and of course to be the influencing motive of his moral conduct.

Perhaps it will be objected, that if this argument be admitted in its full extent, that then nineteen parts in twenty of the bible are useless: to which I say, that not nineteen parts in twenty are useless, but ninety-nine parts in a hundred are so: and that the whole of revealed religion, inasmuch as it regards the Gentiles, consists in observing the *ten* command-

b

ments,

ments, or the Moral Law, as delivered by Moses. Nor do I find that there was more required by the Deity from the Jews: for tho' the ceremonial law was obligatory upon them, yet when once they were taught it, being in constant practice, there was no danger that they would forget it: nor could the practice, no more than the ceremonies of other nations, be deemed burthensome. Notwithstanding, however, this brevity of the Mosaic law, we find that the Jews were commanded to devote the *seventh* part of their time for inculcating it in their families, with the proofs of its having been a divine communication. Now, if the short code of Moses required a *seventh* part of the time of the Jews, I would fain know how much time would be necessary for attaining a perfect knowledge of the Old and New Testaments. To argue from analogy, which in the present instance cannot be questioned as conclusive, it would, at least, require the ordinary compass of human life.

I apprehend, 4thly, That any religious system, founded upon revelation, which cannot be proved to have existed *immediately after* the revelation is known to have been given, must be false and erroneous: for otherwise it
would

would be tantamount to affirming, that though a revelation of the will of God had been given, yet that the system, which first sprung up in consequence of it, was false and erroneous; that is, that God revealed his will, when he must have *foreknown*, that his energizing himself would be attended with an opposite effect to that which he had intended; and which error would not admit of any future remedy. For to say, that his intention might be afterwards discovered by human ingenuity, would be depriving religion of its only solid support—*Revelation*.

Now I affirm that, from the testimony of the Catholics themselves, the Ebionites, or a sect which professed the same opinions, (for perhaps the individuals of it acquired not the appellation of Ebionite for two centuries after Jesus) existed in the apostolic age, which is more than the Catholics affirm of *themselves*, and consequently *immediately after* the first preaching of the apostles among the Gentiles.—2dly, I affirm, that the Ebionites only acknowledged as Scripture, for the regulation of their conduct, the Moral Law of Moses; not that they entirely rejected the Pentateuch, but they only

received it as they did other histories, that is, as containing *truths* and *falsehoods*, and of course by no means as the WORD OF GOD. As to the sixteen books of the prophecies, and the other books of the Old Testament, they utterly rejected them: the histories of Sampson, Elijah, &c. being subjects of mirth to them. They, besides, rejected all the books of the New Testament, firmly maintaining, that the promised Messiah had not yet appeared. The following sheets, including the 2d Part, preparing for the press, will afford ample testimony to the truth of these assertions.

Those persons, who are conversant with Dr. Priestley's writings, must know that the great object of his speculations is to shew, that the Ebionites, or a sect which held the same tenets, were the *antient, true, and genuine* disciples of Jesus: whoever has been convinced by his writings of this should allow, that what was included in their faith and practice ought to be the rule for ours. But the Doctor, by supposing that they were Christians, has missed the great discovery, *that Christianity itself is only a sophistication of the religion of Jesus*; for instead of being Christians, they were the most determinate

minate enemies of Christianity; holding its tenets in the utmost derision, and contempt.

In proof of the antiquity of this sect, I will here adduce two testimonies unnoticed by Dr. Priestley: the first is Marius Mercator, who flourished in the beginning of the 5th century, and who, besides being one of the most learned men of his time in what regarded theology, had moreover the advantage of having resided at the eastern metropolis of the Roman world; and of speaking and writing both the Greek and Latin languages with equal fluency. The other is Primasius the author of *Prædestinatus*, who flourished nearly a century earlier. He was of Syrmium, and had doubtless any advantage which could result from the conversation or writings of his countryman Photinus, being his contemporary. Marius says, that *Ebion was a Stoic Philosopher, who, while John the Evangelist was yet in Asia, affirmed that Jesus was a common man, and that in this he followed the gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke; for which reason John thought fit to write his Gospel to confute such a notion* *. Primasius says, that

* Hic tempore adhuc Joannis Apostoli intra Asiam exit, et Christum hominem communem ex Joseph et Maria

that *Luke confuted the Ebionæns at Antioch* †. But Luke the Evangelist is supposed by almost all Christian writers to have died 30 years *before* John wrote his Gospel: so, one would imagine, that had the Ebionæns been properly confuted by Luke, there was no occasion for John to have written his Gospel solely with that view; for to suppose, that the Evangelist had not properly confuted them, would be, I apprehend, little short of impiety. Be this however as it may, these passages show what opinions the learned amongst the Catho-

ria natum, et eum vitæ merito omne humanum genus præivisse, proque hoc in dei filium adoptatum, ausus est prædicare, asserens se Mattæi, Marci, et Lucæ Evangelistarum auctoritatem secutum. Quo tempore Joannes Apostolus contra hunc condidit Evangelium, quo præfatus est, *in principio esse Verbum, et Verbum esse apud Patrem, et Deum esse Verbum*. Diff. seu app. ad contradictionem 12 anathematismi.

† Ebionæi Hominem solum fuisse Dominum *Jesum Christum* asserunt; et legis mandata more judaico custodienda constituunt. Hos Lucas Evangelista apud Antiochenam ecclesiam inveniens condemnavit, docens angelum dixisse ad Mariam. *Spiritus Sanctus superveniet in te, et virtus altissimi obumbrabit te. Ideo et id quod ex te nascetur sanctum, vocabitur filius dei*. Prædestinati, lib. 1. Har. 10.

lics

lics held in the 4th and 5th centuries respecting the antiquity of the Ebionites.

The Ebionites are to be met with in the antient fathers under very different appellations, which is one reason of their having been overlooked by the moderns. For the moderns knowing nothing accurately of the opinions of the antient Heretics, or of that which constituted the essence, or inseparable leading feature, of each heresy, were incapable of discovering them, under so many various appellations; as *Hebrews believing in Christ*, *Jews*, *Samaritans*, *Nicolaitans*, *Nazarenes*, *Ebionites*, *Elcesaites*, *Offens*, *Cerinthians*, *Carpocratians*, *Mas-salians*, or *Enthusiasts*, and perhaps by others. Now, that these were all the same sect will clearly appear from Epiphanius and Theodoret, because each of them entertained certain notions which constituted the *Essence* of the Ebionite sentiment. Again, the various sorts of Gnostics entertained some peculiar notions which constituted the essence of that heresy, and was the direct opposite to that which distinguished the Ebionæan sect; yet so ignorant are the moderns* in this respect, that they have jumbled

* By this term I intend the writers of this century, except when otherwise particularized.

these

these two sects together, though they entertained quite opposite opinions.

I know that I shall be thought by many exceeding *presumptuous* in my manner of speaking of the *learned moderns*, as though I spoke *ironically*: and to this I plead guilty. For however considerable their acquirements may be in other respects, yet I can with safety affirm, that with respect to the antient heresies, of which they particularly undertake to treat, not one of them has even got over the threshold; but what is worse, by ignorantly dogmatizing they have prevented others, of far inferior abilities, who, perhaps, like the author, by candidly examining, without having in view any religious system, might have chanced to have discovered the truth. For it cannot be denied how much a person of moderate abilities feels himself damped in his literary pursuits, when he happens to see reason to differ from men of great literary fame. He has besides all the learned, that is all those who are able to *repeat* the sentiments of *truly learned* men, to contend with; who, not knowing the grounds upon which those persons whose opinions they repeat have formed them, are absolutely incapable of
being

being argued with. However I have to countenance me, in what will particularly appear in the 2d Part, the authority of the learned, candid, and accurate, Marius Mercator, whom I have already mentioned; and who, as a *writer*, and *speaker*, of *both* languages, must be allowed as an authority to be much superior to that of all the moderns, were they ten times more numerous and learned than they are; this I say independently of his being a principal disputant in the controversies, the most metaphysical, and abstract that ever sprung up to puzzle mankind; which came to a head in his time, I mean the Pelagian, Cælestian, Nestorian, and Eutychian, heresies. Moreover, though perhaps younger than Augustine by twenty years, yet in their intercourse of letters, he is treated by that learned father, whose good sense chiefly distinguished him among his brethren, with the greatest deference. To this *invincible* authority I will add that of his editor, the learned John Garner; whose writings seem to be unknown even to Mr. Gibbon; and who, in treating of the Nestoan heresy, seems not to have known that Marius Mercator was a principal person engaged

c

gaged

gaged in that controversy ; and who would have given him more true information respecting it than all the *learned* moderns whom he has sometimes chosen to be guided by. I may besides say in my own defence, that the *learned* moderns treat with little ceremony the *truly learned* ancients ; and that, forsooth, because they do not understand them. Thus it is common with them to tax Epiphanius with *credulity* ; and very justly ; but the *judicious* Mosheim, as cited by Dr. Chelsum, says, ‘ that the work of Epiphanius is full of inaccuracies, and errors, and discovers almost in *every* page, the *ignorance* of his author.’ This I affirm to be the true character of Mosheim’s own writings for four or five centuries after Christ : and that, when his name will be forgotten, the Work of Epiphanius, with all his *inaccuracies and errors*, will be sought after by those who seek *real* knowledge, instead of the absurd dreams and reveries of the moderns.

As this *laborious* German is the great Protestant Doctor, whose opinions influence every sect among them, I hope that some one of his disciples and admirers will undertake to explain

plain the following terms or phrases; and shew that they were rightly understood by him, nay even that any one of them was: for if not, it will follow that he knew nothing of the heresies which sprung up in the early ages of Christianity; and which I affirm he did not; nor any one of his disciples that I have met with. The terms and phrases are as follow: Hypotasis, υποστασις, εϋποστατος, ανυποστατος, Homoousios, Homœousios, Substantia, Substantialis, Substantivus, Consubstantialis, Consubstantivus, the hypostatical union, confounding, confusing, and mingling, erring by excess, and erring by defect, and others connected with, or resulting from, them. Now, to treat of the heresies without knowing the *precise import* of these terms and phrases, with any prospect of success, would be equally reasonable, as to expect to make a progress in geometry without knowing what squares, circles, and triangles are. And it is in consequence of this ignorance, which I apprehend is now universal, that the Athanasian Creed, which is a *just, true and accurate* epitome of the Catholic faith to the beginning of the fifth century, and easily explicable, is

by one said to be a collection of *unmeaning* sounds or direct contradictions,—by another, the production of a drunken man—and by all condemned and wished to be got rid of.

I am also inclined to think, that as the members of the established church have succeeded in foiling the dissenters in their *ambitious* designs, that they could not better employ themselves, than in turning over the musty fathers, and endeavouring to find out the meaning of the above terms: as there can be no doubt of a good bishopric being the fruits, when Bp. Horsley's *puny* labours have been so amply rewarded. It will, besides enable them to correct any thing unfounded that I may happen to advance.

Were we not upon the eve of a war, when it is highly *improper* to be attempting innovations, I would recommend to our minister's consideration the advice given by Sicinnius to Nectarius Bishop of Constantinople, who, upon being consulted, respecting the proper measures to be taken at the second General Council, called together by Theodosius the
Great.

Great to reconcile all Christian Sects, but particularly the Arians, to the Catholic Faith, recommended, that the Heretics should be asked, whether those of the Fathers who gave expositions of the Scriptures before the rise of Arianism, should be held to be *orthodox*, or *heterodox*: if they say the *latter*, desire them to pronounce an anathema against them: which if they should dare to do, their own flocks will expel them from their churches: if they allow that they were orthodox, then by their expositions we shall prove that we are right, and they wrong. In like manner were his majesty to convene a general council composed of an equal number from the various sects in this kingdom, the sectarists, who, however worthy as individuals, yet disgrace Christianity for having given rise to such various systems, would, I am confident, find themselves in a similar dilemma. Moreover, the proceedings being published in our newspapers would be the means of laying the foundation of a general religious reform consonant to the true spirit of Christianity. And, in my apprehension, the
Church

Church of England would have fewer alterations to undergo, than any other church, or sect, whatever.

I am now to apologize for the incorrectnesses in the printing: however I hope they will not be found such as materially to affect the sense; particularly when corrected agreeably to the Errata. Being, I may truly say, only a passenger, I have had recourse to public libraries for the purpose of consulting the Fathers, and verifying those passages, which, as the reader will perceive, I have taken from the moderns: and being frequently obliged to print off my note, depending upon my authority, I have in two or three instances been led into an error: but which will be found rectified in the errata.

To write elegantly in controversy I apprehend to be very difficult: neither do I pretend to it upon any subject. I would not mispend my time in polishing my language were I certain of attaining to the highest literary fame: my object is solely to be understood, and to impress my reader with *important* truth; therefore have not avoided repetitions, which, though generally

generally deemed inelegancies, I, nevertheless, find them in first rate authors.

Truth having ever been my pursuit, the pointing out my errors, so far from offending, will be esteemed a favour.

I fear that when I perceived the writers, whom I make the subject of my remarks, managing their arguments in such a manner as to impose on ordinary readers, that my language has not been sufficiently guarded; and that it will be found that I have imbibed some of the polemical asperity of Theologians: but my indignation at such conduct I felt to be too strong to be repressed, having frequently discovered myself, upon consulting the original, to be the dupe of my credulity.

Thinking I can say with the Geometrician, *εὐγεννα*, should excuse trivial errors; being truly impatiently desirous to make others participate of the satisfaction.



PRELIMINARY DISQUISITION.

THE Author of the following sheets hereby avows himself an Ebionite; that is, one who believes in *the divine mission of Jesus*—that He was *only a mere Man*—and that *he was not at all the Christ, or Messiah, or the Anointed foretold by the Jewish Prophets, under whose government the Jews were to enjoy that temporal prosperity described by them—and rejects, or makes little account of, the Books of the New Testament, excepting only the Gospel of Mark.*

It may be thought that the Ebionites held no such tenets, and of course that this notion is quite novel, groundless, and fantastical. The following passages, however, from the Fathers, will *clearly shew* that the *Ebionites*, nay even *all the Jewish believers in Jesus*, who cannot be denied to have been the first converts to the divine mission of Jesus, entertained these sentiments, and consequently that this is *the true faith*.

The first passages which I shall adduce will be from

B

Origen.

A. D. 230. Origen. His early age—his learning—his integrity—his having spent the most material part of his life in or near the land of Judea, and of course having the best means of arriving at the truth—his inquisitiveness gratified to the utmost extent by his worthy and opulent Mæcenas, Ambrose, justly entitle him to the utmost confidence with regard to facts, and to a precedence over all the Fathers. This character of Origen is supported by the unanimous testimony of the Ancients; by those, who, when orthodoxy assumed a *more consistent* form than in Origen's time, and who of course differed from him, nay taxed him with holding *heretical* notions; still imputed the *Errors to the Man*: his heart was *pure*, even according to their own confession¹. Will it be believed after this, that *within this present century* it has been discovered by the very learned (if reading constitutes learning) Doctor Mosheim, that *very ingenious and acute German*, that notwithstanding all these praises of the Ancients respecting Ori-

¹ ΟΙΟΝ ΓΗΝ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΤΟΙΟΝΔΕ ΦΑΣΙΝ ΤΟΝ ΙΡΟΠΟΝ· ΚΑΙ ΟΙΟΝ ΤΟΝ ΙΡΟΠΟΝ ΤΟΙΟΝΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΕΠΕΔΕΙΚΝΥΙΟ. As was his speech, so was his conduct; and as was his conduct, so was his speech. Euseb. C. VI. ch. iii. p. 261.--- Priestley's Third Letters to Dr. now Bp. Horsley, p. 5, n.

gen's character, that his veracity is so questionable, that *he would not believe him upon his oath?* But above all, will it be credited that a Right Reverend Bishop, the Bishop of St. David's, should, in a *re-publication*, so often repeat the same charge as even to affect one's feelings? By that Right Reverend Bishop who insists upon *explicit historical evidence* in support of facts; and I presume the nearer in time and place the evidence is to the facts recorded, the more worthy the testimony is of credit, at least I have been so taught by that judicious Catholic, Muratori, who thus disproves a multitude of Popish miracles: yet these two ingenious and learned gentlemen ground their sentiment upon a writer (Sulpitius Severus) who flourished *three hundred years* nearly *after* the very extraordinary facts he records; facts *unrecorded* by any other *historian*; nay facts, which contradict the *uniform* testimony of preceding historians: for these represent Adrian as *no* persecutor; whereas Sulpitius Severus represents him as *a* persecutor; moreover he lived 1500 miles from the scene of action. But to return to Origen.

Origen says, writing against Celsus, that “ *they*
 “ *of the Jews, who believe in Jesus, have not aban-*
 “ *doned the Law of their ancestors, for they live*
 “ *according to it, being furnished agreeably to the*
 “ *expectation of the poverty of the Law: for a*
 “ *beggar is called among the Jews (that is in the*
 “ *Hebrew language) Ebion: and they of the Jews,*
 “ *who have received Jesus as the Christ, go by the*
 “ *name of Ebionæans.*(2)” Here then we find, that
 notwithstanding the result of the Council of the
 Apostles held in Jerusalem, and which we have re-
 corded in the Acts; and notwithstanding the divine
 Paul’s shewing the futility of the Jewish ordinances,

(2) Οἱ ἀπο Ἰουδαίων εἰς Ἰησοῦν πιστευούτες ἔκταλτοιοῦσιν τὸν παλαιὸν
 νόμον, βίβσι γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸν, ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ καὶ τὴν ἐκδοχὴν πτωχείας
 τῶν νόμων γεγεννημένοι. Ἐβίων τε γὰρ ὁ πτωχὸς παρὰ Ἰουδαίους καλεῖται,
 καὶ Ἐβιωνάιοι χρηματίζουσιν οἱ ἀπο Ἰουδαίων τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὡς Χριστὸν παρα-
 δεξάμενοι. Origen in Celsus, p. 56. edit. Spencer.—Horsley’s Tracts,
 p. 153. The learned Bishop, inadvertently I presume, translates Ἰησοῦν,
 Christ. A reader, unversed in these subjects, may think this not worth
 noting; however he may change his mind, when he is informed, that
 in the time of Origen, there were many who held that Christ was a
 superior intelligence; some a god, superior to Jehovah the maker of this
 world; and that, by Christ, the orthodox understood the union of Man
 and God: but, by all, Jesus was supposed to be either a mere Man, or
 nothing; that is, an appearance without reality.

and

and that they were only *mere shadows of the good things to come*; yet still, that *all the Jewish believers* (Origen's words admit of no exception) abode by and followed their own Laws. Had we no other direct testimony to the fact, it might be *hence* certainly concluded, that not *one* of the Jewish believers received, as canonical, either the Acts of the Apostles, or the Epistles of Holy Paul.—But to proceed. He again says, “There are *some* too, who receive Jesus, boasting to be Christians upon this account, and are moreover willing to live, *like the multitudes of the Jews, after the Law of the Jews*. And these are the double Ebionites, whether they acknowledge *Him*, in like manner with ourselves, *to have been born of a Virgin*, or that *He was not so*, but as other men³.” Here we find that a *belief* in the miraculous conception, or the *disbelieving* it, did not make these believers *double Ebionites*; neither did it constitute a

³ Εἶπεν δὲ τινες καὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀποδεχόμενοι, ὡς παρὰ τὸ Χριστιανοὶ εἶναι αὐχάντες, εἰς δὲ κατὰ τὸν Ἰουδαίων νομὸν, ὡς τὰ Ἰουδαίων πληθεύει, βίαν ἐθέλοντες· οὗτοι δὲ εἰσιν οἱ διττοὶ Ἐβιωναῖοι, ἧτοις ἐκ παρθένου ὁμολογούσιν ὁμοίως ἡμῖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ἢ ἢ ἐκ ἑτέρου γεγενῆσθαι, ἀλλ' ὡς τὰς λοιπὰς ἀνθρώπους. Contra Celsum, p. 272.—Horsley's Tracts, p. 155.

second sort of Ebionites, as we are informed by the ingenious and learned moderns. What was it then that constituted a double Ebionite? It was their believing in Jesus, and being willing, *like* the Jews, (which shews that they were *not* Jews) to live according to the Law of the Jews. So then as they were not Jews, they must have been Gentile believers. Here then we have Gentile believers, who, as well as the Jewish, thought little of the Epistles of Holy Paul. Now as we may perceive, and indeed as is generally admitted, that the Jewish believers were nicknamed *Ebionites* by the Christians, for being contented with the *poor* expectations of the Law, and rejecting the *rich* expectations of the Gospel, I think it may be fairly inferred, that the Gentiles, who thought in like manner, were nicknamed by the Christians *Double-Ebionites*, as being doubly to blame; for Jews had some apology, force of education, habit, &c. but such Gentile Believers were without excuse. And that the Ebionites only thought Jesus to have been a mere Man, whether they *believed* in his miraculous conception, or *not*, will hence appear evident.—Origen says, “ And when you consider the faith concerning
“ our

“ our Saviour, of those of the Jews, who believe in
 “ Christ, some thinking him to be the son of Joseph
 “ and Mary, and others of Mary only and the Divine
 “ Spirit, but not believing his Deity, or the God-word⁴.”

As there is no difference of opinion respecting this last particular, to adduce farther proof is unnecessary. I therefore trust that I have made out, to the entire satisfaction of my readers, my first head; that the Ebionites, or Double-Ebionites, thought Jesus to be only a mere Man, whether believers in the miraculous conception or not. I shall now proceed to my second.

I affirm, secondly, that *the Ebionites did not think that Jesus was the Messiah, or the Christ, or the Anointed foretold by the Jewish prophets, under whose government the Jews were to enjoy that temporal prosperity described by them.* For the proof of this position, the first of the Fathers whom I shall cite is Athanasius, called by the Ancients the *Father* of Orthodoxy. He says, writing against the Arians, that “ Some lying

A. D.
326.

⁴ Καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων πνευματικῶν εἰς τὴν περὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος πίστεως, ὅτε μὲν ἐκ Μαρίας, καὶ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ οἰομένων αὐτὸν εἶναι, ὅτε μὲν ἐκ Μαρίας μόνης καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος, καὶ μὲν καὶ μετὰ τῆς περὶ αὐτοῦ θεολογίας. Comment. in Mat. Ed. Huetii, vol. i. p. 427.—Hist. Op. vol. iii. p. 167.

“ in

“ in this respect, and some in that, or *thinking like*
 “ *the Jews*, that the Lord *had not AT ALL* come, have
 “ erred. But this alone has more madly dared against
 “ the Deity itself, saying that there is *no word at all*,
 “ nor that the God is Father^s.” Hence it appears, that
the Jews did believe that the Christ *had not AT ALL*
come; and it also appears, that there were others,
 not Jews, and of course Gentiles, *who thought LIKE*
the Jews, that Christ *had not AT ALL* come. I apprehend that these Gentiles must have been *believing Gentiles*, or *followers of Jesus*; but the conclusiveness of this inference will entirely depend upon the Jews, whom they are said to have thought *like*, being proved to have been *believing Jews*; for without this being proved, the inference will be only proportionate to the probability. First, then I say, that the Jews, in this passage, *must* have been believing Jews; for it would have been absurd in him to say, that Heathens thought as Jews, if by Jews he meant unbelieving

^s Αἱ μὲν εἰως, αἱ δὲ ἐκείνως κατὰ ψευδομέναι, ἡ μηδολως ἐπιδὲ δημηκεναι τον κυριον, ὡς Ἰουδαιοι νομισουσις, ἐπλανηθησαν· αὐτῇ δὲ μονη μανικωλερον εἰς αὐτὴν θεοτήλα τέτολμηκε λεγασα, μηδ ολως εἶναι λογον, μηδε τον θεον πατέρα εἶναι. Contra Arianos, Orig. i. Opera, vol. i. p. 300.—Hist. Op. vol. iv. p. 220.

Jews: for it would be a truism, a self-evident proposition. Secondly, I ask, with what propriety could the terms *lying* and *erring* be applied to Heathens, who knew nothing of the matter? With what propriety could *erring* be predicated of Jews, who did not AT ALL believe? Should a doubt remain, I I trust it will evaporate as we proceed.—I shall adduce another passage from the same author. He says, apologizing for Dionysius, who had been accused of having given rise to Arianism, by some unguarded expressions in his writings against the Sabellians—“Dare
 “ they then affirm, that the Apostles themselves
 “ thought as Arius? for the Apostles proclaim Christ
 “ himself to be a man of Nazareth, and to have
 “ suffered—they therefore setting forth such things,
 “ since they made use of these words, did they know
 “ Christ only as a Man, and nothing more? God
 “ forbid. They had this by no means in mind; but
 “ they did this as wise master-builders, and stewards
 “ of the mysteries of God; and they had this good
 “ reason: For since *the then Jews*, being astray (them-
 “ selves), and having led astray the Greeks, thought
 “ *Christ a mere Man*, only that he was to come of

“ the seed of David, like the other children begotten
 “ of David—neither did they believe *him* to be *God*,
 “ or that the *word* was made *flesh*—therefore the
 “ blessed Apostles, with much wisdom, first set forth
 “ to the Jews what respected the humanity of the
 “ Saviour; that having by all means persuaded them,
 “ from the signs that appeared and were done, that
 “ *the Christ had come*: and afterwards they instruct-
 “ ed them in the belief of his Deity; shewing, that
 “ the works done were not those of Man, but of
 “ God. For instance: Peter saying that the Man
 “ Christ suffered, immediately added—This is the
 “ Prince of Life⁶.” I apprehend that *the then*
Jews,

⁶ Ουδεν γαρ αυτοις ατολμητον, οτι και αυτοι αποστολοι τε Αρειν
 εφρονεν. Ανθρωπον γαρ αυτον απο Ναζαρελ, και παθον τον Χριστον
 απαγγελουσιν, εκεινων τοιουν τοιαυτα φανταζομενων, αρ επειδη τοις
 ρημασι τειοις εχρησαντο, μονον ανθρωπον ηδεισαν τον Χριστον οι απο-
 στολοι, και πλεον εδεν; μη γενοιτο. Ουκ εστιν εδε εις νυν ποτε λαβειν⁶
 αλλα και τωτο ως αρχιεκτονες σωφοι, και οικονομοι μυστηριων Θεω
 πηποιηκασι. Και την αιτιαν εχουσιν ευλογον. Επειδη γαρ οι τοτε Ιουδαιοι
 πλανηθεντες, και πλανησαντες Ελληνας, ενομιζον τον Χριστον ψιλον
 ανθρωπον, μονον εκ σπερματος Δαβιδ αρχεσθαι, καθ' ομοιοτητα των εκ
 του Δαβιδ αλλων γενομενων τεκνων· ητε δε Θεον αυτον, εδε οτι λογος
 σαρκος εγενετο επιτευων. τωτε ενεκα μετα πολλης συνεσεως οι μακαριοι
 αποστολοι τα ανθρωπινα τε Σωτηρος εξηγουντο πρωτον τοις Ιουδαιοις,

Jews, in this passage, were *believing Jews*: for that unbelieving Jews ever preached, or discoursed with the Gentiles respecting Christ or the Messiah, who was foretold by their prophets that *was to come*, is not only devoid of any *explicit historical evidence*, and therefore unworthy of any attention; but is, besides, utterly improbable. For the Jews of the apostolic age having no other notions of their Messiah's kingdom, saving that of their own great temporal prosperity—and that all nations would, during *his* government, or the government of the *anointed*, be in subjection to them—it is, I say, utterly improbable that they should needlessly render themselves still more unpopular than they were, by holding forth such sentiments. Bp. Horsley supposes that the Greeks here mentioned, were *Profelytes of the Gate*, whom the then Jews led astray; but, admitting that there were Greeks *thus distinguished* (for which supposition, however, *no proof*

ἵνα ὁλως πείσαντες αὐτοὺς, ἐκ τῶν φαινομένων καὶ γενομένων σημείων, ἐληλυθεν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν, λοιπὸν καὶ εἰς τὰ περὶ τῆς θεότητος αὐτοῦ πείσιν αὐτοὺς ἀναγαγῶσι, δεικνύντες ὅτι τὰ γενομένα ἔργα οὐκ εἰν ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλὰ Θεὸς. Αἰελεὶ Πέτρος ὁ λεγὼν ἄνδρα παθόντα τὸν Χριστὸν, εὐθύς συνήπλην ὅτος ἀρχηγὸς τῆς ζωῆς εἶναι, &c. &c. De Sententia Dionysii—Opera, vol. i. p. 553, 554 --- Priestley's First Letter to Horsley, p. 39, n.

exists, that is, *explicit historical evidence*), still the term *Greeks* will not only include these, were there any such; but also every other Greek, or *all* the Greeks: and we are moreover assured by Bp. Horsley, p. 21, that Athanasius calls things by their names; that is, I presume, makes use of proper terms to express his notions, and therefore his language should be taken in its natural force. However, as Bp. Horsley thinks that these *then Jews* were *unbelieving Jews*, the sentiment of a person of his Lordship's *abilities* and *information* shall be considered; though he does not pretend to support it by *explicit evidence* from the antients, which, he himself very justly assures us, is the *only* circumstance which should have weight in controversies of this nature.—

Whether the following passage from Justin Martyr tends to confirm my sentiment, that these Jews were *believing Jews*, and to shew the insolidity of his Lordship's, that these Jews were *unbelieving Jews*, is submitted to his Lordship's own determination. Justin says, in his Apology, “ For the
 “ Jews, who had the prophecies, and always expect-
 “ ed the coming of Christ, knew him not; and not
 “ only so, but killed him. But the Gentiles, who
 “ never

“ never heard of CHRIST—UNTIL the Apostles, setting
 “ out from Jerusalem, taught them the things concerning
 “ him—being filled with joy and faith, gave them-
 “ selves up to the unbegotten God, through Jesus
 “ Christ⁷.”—I now apprehend that I may conclude
 that the *then Jews* of Athanasius, were the *believing*
Jews of Justin; and who, if they were led astray,
 were, it seems, led astray by the Apostles themselves,
 and thus *innocently* led astray the Gentiles. But, should
 the Bishop still maintain his own sentiment, it will
 be incumbent upon him to shew, by *explicit evi-*
dence from the antients, that *unbelieving Jews* went
 about teaching the Gentiles their own notions respect-
 ing Christ, *after* the Apostles had set out from Judea
 upon the same errand, for Justin is express against
 a prior teaching. No inferences should be at
 all attended to; the *most explicit language* is requi-

⁷ Ιεδαιοι γορ εχοντες τας προφητειας κ' αι προσδοκησαντες τον
 Χριστον παραγενεσομενον, ηγνωσαν· ε μονον δε, αλλα παραχρησθηλο-
 οι δε απο των εθνων, μηδεποτε μηδιν ακουσαντες περι τε Χριστου,
 μεχρις ε οι απο Ιερουσαλεμ εξελθοντες αποστολοι αυτη εμνηνυσαν τα
 περι αυτη, κ' τας προφητειας παρεδοκαν, πληρωθεντες χαρας κ' πιστεως,
 τοις ειδωλοις απειλαξαν, κ' τω αγεννητω θεω δια τε Χριστου εαυτοις
 ανεθηκαν.

sute to establish, or even to render at all probable, so improbable an hypothesis.—Still, however, farther to strengthen this argument, if its force can be added to, the following passages will shew that the Ebionites and Double Ebionites, were called *Jews* by the orthodox, notwithstanding their believing in Jesus.—But first I shall put down an observation of Dr. Priestley respecting Mosheim, which, as not controverted by any of his opponents, may be the more implicitly relied upon for its accuracy. The Doctor observes, Hist. Op. vol. iii. p. 191, that Mosheim produces no authority, in his Dissertations, for his assertion (of a church of Christian Jews residing at Jerusalem subsequent to the time of Adrian); “ he only says, that “ he cannot reconcile the fact, which Origen mentions, with his seeming unwillingness to allow the “ Ebionites to be Christians.” Now, as few persons were better read in the Fathers than Mosheim—and as it appears, from what Dr. Priestley says, that he was upon the *watch* to discover any thing in Origen which might induce a belief, that Origen thought the Ebionites were Christians—and as his *search* was unsuccessful—we may rest assured, that there is in

Origen

Origen *no* passage which has a tendency to induce such a belief. It seemed that this appeared a very extraordinary circumstance to Mosheim; but its extraordinariness entirely resulted from his own prejudices: for he had no suspicion (and I apprehend that this notion is actually universal) that there could be a believer in the Divine mission of Jesus, who did not believe that he was the CHRIST. But the truth is far otherwise; for *no Jew ever yet believed* (unless we are to credit Epiphanius, with regard to a *single* one mentioned by Dr. Priestley; but whose testimony, unless supported by other writers, is in any matter little regarded)—I say, then, THAT NO JEW EVER YET BELIEVED that Jesus was the CHRIST, or their promised MESSIAH: and therefore that Origen was perfectly justifiable in *not* calling the Ebionites, or Double Ebionites, Christians; seeing that they did not acknowledge Jesus to be the CHRIST, or the promised MESSIAH. And though Athanasius apologizes for those believers in Jesus, who held these *mean, low* sentiments respecting him, yet he does not call them Christians.—But what crowns this argument is, That, notwithstanding
all

all Dr. Priestley's industry, he has not as yet been able to adduce the *explicit language* of any of the Fathers to support his notion, that the Ebionites were esteemed Christians; and inferences, as Bp. Horsley justly observes, are in these cases totally inadmissible. As Bp. Horsley, however, following the footsteps of Mosheim, declares that the veracity of Origen is so problematical, that he would not believe him UPON HIS OATH—but with what justice will be hereafter considered—I shall therefore for the present wave insisting upon the testimony of Origen.—I will lay before the reader a passage of Athanasius, who, according to the Bishop, as already observed, calls things by their names. Athanasius says, that “the
 “ followers of Marcellus, and of Photinus of Ancyra,
 “ in Galatia, denied the eternal personality of Christ
 “ and his everlasting kingdom, *in like manner with*
 “ *the Jews*, on pretence of establishing a monarchy³.”
 This passage tends to prove that the Jews, in note

³ Οι απο Μαρκελλου κ' Φωτεινου των αγκυρογαλων, οι την προαιωνιον υπαρξιν του Χριστου, κ' την αλελεινητον αυτου βασιλειαν ομοιωσ Ιουδαιοις αθειωσιν. επι προφασει συνιστασθαι δοκειν τη μοναρχια. De Synodis Armen.---Opera, vol. i. p. 898.---Hist. Op. vol. iii. p. 402.

n. 5, p. 8, were *believing* Jews—for he could not compare Marcellus and Photinus to the *unbelieving Jews*—and of course that these *believing* Jews did *not* believe that Jesus was the CHRIST or MESSIAH; but it moreover proves that there were Gentile believers who thought *in the like manner* as the *believing* Jews, none of whom of course held *higher* notions of Jesus; and consequently, with the Bishop's good leave, and the learned Mosheim's, who is *his guide*, according to Athanasius, there were no *orthodox* Jews *at all*; and for omitting the mention of whom, Origen would not be believed upon his oath, by these two charitable and learned champions of the *Christian verity*: so that Athanasius confirms what Origen asserts—that *all* the Jews were called Ebionites, because they placed their future hopes in the promises of the Law of Moses, discarding every idea of the *eternal personality* of Christ, and of his *eternal kingdom*; and consequently *rejecting* our books of the New Testament, in which these doctrines are *clearly* set forth:—as also, that there were *Gentile believers*, who, in like manner as the Jewish believers, placed their future hopes in the promises of the Law of Moses,

D

discarding

discarding every idea of the *eternal personality* of Christ, and of his eternal kingdom; and consequently rejecting those books of the New Testament in which these doctrines are set forth. So that this alone is a complete justification of Origen's not having concealed an Orthodox Church of Christians at Jerusalem or Ælia, subsequent to the reign of Adrian, as there were none such to conceal; and shews how *well-founded* these defamers of the dead were (Mosheim, and the Bishop of St. David's) in *reiterating* their affirmations, that they would not believe UPON HIS OATH a celebrated ancient, whose character for integrity was never impeached, till he was discovered not to support the groundless notions of these two very learned divines. I therefore trust that I have proved my second position, that *the Ebionites, or double Ebionites, did NOT believe that Jesus was the CHRIST.* And therefore we should not be surprised, that that *plodding* and *speculative* German was disappointed in not finding a church of ORTHODOX CHRISTIANS amongst a people amongst whom there were NO CHRISTIANS AT ALL.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, I affirm that *the Ebionites, or double Ebionites rejected, or made little account of the books of the New Testament, excepting only the Gospel of Mark.* To prove this, I shall first adduce a passage from Epiphanius, who says, “Ebion wishes to have the appellation of “Christians, but not therefore the practice, and the “opinion, and the knowledge, and the assent with “the *Gospels* and *Apostles* concerning the Faith.” Hence I might infer, that Ebion received neither the Epistles nor Gospels; but having already observed that his testimony, unless supported, is of little value; I shall therefore *strengthen* it with this passage from Eusebius, who says, speaking of the Ebionites, “And making use of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, they have but little respect for “the rest ¹⁰.” Hence it appears that, according to

A. D.
368.

315.

ἡ Χριστιανῶν ἐκλετὰι ἔχειν τὴν προσηγορίαν ὡς γὰρ δητῶθεν τῆν τε πρᾶξιν, καὶ τὴν γνώμην καὶ τὴν γνώσιν, καὶ τὴν τῶν εὐαγγελίων, καὶ ἀποστόλων περὶ πίστεως συγκατάθεσιν. Hær. Bp. Horsley's Tracts, p. 133.

¹⁰ Εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ μόνῳ τῷ καθ' Ἑβραϊκὴς λεγομένῳ χρωμένοι, τῶν λοιπῶν σμικρὸν ποιεῖν λόγον. Hist. lib. iii. cap. 27. p. 121.—Hist. Op. vol. iii. p. 169.

Eusebius, the Ebionites held the books of the New Testament very cheap. The next passage which I shall adduce, is from a much esteemed ecclesiastical historian, Theodoret, Bp. of Cyrus; who, A. D. 423. in his History of Heretics, says, “ that the *Nazarenes* are *Jews*, who honour Christ as a *righteous Man*, and use the Gospel according to *Peter*¹¹”. Having already proved that *all the believing Jews* were *Ebionites*, it follows, that the Nazarenes being Jews, who used the Gospel of Peter, were Ebionites: but it may be asked, what Gospel was this? We know of no such Gospel, say the orthodox? Granted. However, as the ancients universally admit that Mark was *only* the amanuensis of Peter, or had only reduced to writing Peter’s discourses, and of course frequently call the Gospel of Mark the Gospel of Peter, to whom in fact it more truly belonged than to Mark, if what they say can be relied on—just as Mr. Fox’s speeches are justly called his, though exhibited to the public by Mr. Woodfall:—I therefore think that I am justi-

¹¹ Οἱ δὲ Ναζωραῖοι Ἰουδαῖοι εἰσὶ, τὸν Χριστὸν τιμῶντες ὡς ἀνθρώπου δικαίου καὶ τῷ καλεσμένῳ κατὰ Πέτρον εὐαγγελίῳ πεχρημένοι. Hær. folio, lib. II. cap. ii.---Opera, vol. iv. p. 219.---Hist. Op. vol. iii. p. 183.

fied in presuming, that Peter's Gospel was the Gospel of Mark. But it may be objected, that if Peter's Gospel was the Gospel of Mark, that I then destroy the testimonies of Epiphanius and Eusebius; who affirm, that the Ebionites did not receive the books of our Canon, and of course not Mark's Gospel. This I allow. But it does not follow, but that *originally*, and in its *purity*, the *Gospel of Mark* was exactly the same as *the Gospel of Peter*, or *the Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which Eusebius and Theodoret mention *only* to have been made use of by the Ebionites or Nazarenes: for Jerome, in the preface to the Four Evangelists, says, “ For if we are to depend upon
 “ the Latin copies, they answer, Upon which? for
 “ there are as many copies almost as manuscripts:
 “ but if the truth is to be sought from many, why,
 “ returning to the original Greek, do we not correct
 “ those which were badly published by faulty interpreters? Here truly a great error hath *grown old*
 “ in our manuscripts; whilst that one Evangelist
 “ hath said more upon the same thing than another,
 “ they have *added* to this what they thought he was
 “ defective in: or whilst one expressed the same
 meaning

“ meaning differently, he who hath chosen one in
 “ preference to the other four, judged that *the others*
 “ should *be amended* according to it. Whence it has
 “ come to pass, that with us all things are inter-
 “ mixed, and *many things* of Luke and Matthew are
 “ found *in* Mark: again, many things of John and
 “ Mark are found in Matthew; and there are things
 “ found in the rest which are peculiar to others¹².”
 Now I apprehend that Jerome was not a man that
 was likely to make such a confession, unless compelled
 to it by the force of truth. He elsewhere observes,
 that “ Mark wrote a short gospel¹³;” so that though

12 Si enim latinis exemplaribus fides est adhibenda, respondeant, quibus. Tot enim sunt exemplaria pene quot codices. Sin autem veritas est quærenda de pluribus, cur non ad græcam originem revertentes, ea quæ vel a vitiosis interpretibus male edita.....corrigimus? Magnus siquidem hic in nostris codicibus error inolevit, dum quod in eadem re alius evangelista plus dixit, in alio quia minus putaverint, addiderunt. Vel dum eundem sensum alius aliter expressit, ille qui unum e quatuor primum legerat, ad ejus exemplum cæteros quoque æstimavit emendandos. Unde accidit, ut apud nos mixta sint omnia, & in Marco plura Lucæ atque Matthæi: rursus in Mathæo plura Joannis & Marci: & in cæteris reliquorum quæ aliis propria sunt, inveniantur. Hieron. in Præf. in 4. Evang. tom. i. p. 1426.---Lard. vol. v. p. 70. n. m.; form. edit. vol. x. p. 170.

13 Marcus.....breve scripsit Evangelium. Hier. de, vol. i. cap. viii. ---Lard. v. 38; former edit. x. 91.

Mark's

Mark's Gospel be the shortest of the Gospels, still the true Gospel of Mark was much shorter. So that I think very reasonable to suppose, that the Gospel of Peter might have been called the Gospel according to the Hebrews, because the Jewish believers, who are sometimes by the fathers called Hebrews, made use of it only; and that the same Jewish believers rejected the Gospel of Mark on account of the *groundless* interpolations which they may have possibly thought to have observed in it. That Mark ever wrote this Gospel is utterly against all probability, at least attended with the circumstances annexed to it: but let the reader judge for himself. Eusebius says, “ that Clement
 “ informs us, that the occasion of writing the Gospel
 “ according to Mark was this: Peter having pub-
 “ lickly preached the word at Rome, and having
 “ spoken the gospel by the spirit, many who were
 “ there entreated Mark to write the things that had
 “ been spoken, he having long accompanied Peter,
 “ and retained what he said; and that when he com-
 “ posed the Gospel, he delivered it to them who had
 “ asked it of him; which when Peter knew, he nei-
 “ ther

“ther forbade it, or encouraged it¹⁴.” I say this account is highly improbable. Why entreat? Were there not many short-hand writers in Rome in those days? But if Peter’s auditors were so desirous of having his discourses in writing, why not employ some one who would have written them in *Latin*? for I presume that it will not be disputed, that the bulk of his proselytes were of the lower order of the people, who knew nothing of Greek. I therefore trust, that as Theodoret affirms, that the Nazarenes used the Gospel of Peter, by which name the Orthodox sometimes distinguish the Gospel of Mark, and by which name, if what they themselves assert be true, it should always have gone by; and as Theodoret also affirms, that the Nazarenes were Jews, and as I have proved that all the Jewish be-

¹⁴ Το δε Μαρκον ταύτην εσχκεναι οικονομίαν· τῇ Πέτρῳ δημοσίᾳ ἐν Ῥώμῃ κηρυξάντος τον λόγον, καὶ πνευματικῶς το εὐαγγέλιον ἐξαιπονίος, τῆς παροῦσας πολλὰς οὐίας παρακαλεσαι τον Μαρκον, ὡς ακολουθησάντα αὐτῷ πορρωθεν, καὶ μεμνημενον των λεχθεντων, αναγραψαι τα ειρημενα· ποιησάντα δε το εὐαγγέλιον, μελαδθαναι, τοις δεομενοις αὐτῆς· ὁπερ ἐπ γνόντα τον Πέτρον, προῖρεπτικῶς μηεκωλυσαι μητε προῖρασθαι. τον μεντοι Ιωαννην εσχάλον συνιδούτα οἱ τα Ῥωμαϊκα ἐν τοις εὐαγγέλιοις δεδωλῶται· προῖραπέντα ὑπο των γνωριμων, πνευματικῶς θεοφορηθέντα, πνευματικῶς ποιησαι εὐαγγέλιον. τοσαῦτα ο Κλημης. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. vi. c. 14, p. 216.---B. Lard. vol. ii. p. 211, n.; former edit. vol. ii. p. 473.

lievers were Ebionites, it follows that the Ebionites received the Gospel of Peter, from which Gospel Mark's *only* differed by a number of *groundless interpolations*. This supposition, if such I can call what appears so evident, is further strengthened by its being well known that to this day neither the antient orthodox writers, nor the moderns, have been able to determine who the Mark was who wrote the gospel, which I shall shew in the Dissertation prefixed to my Harmony. Lastly, Faustus says “ that the Jews, “ through prepossession for Moses, being satiated with “ the Old Testament, rejected the New(15), These were evidently believers in Jesus, and the language comprehends all such, and shews that Faustus knew of *no orthodox* Jews.

Having now, I trust, clearly proved my three positions—that the Ebionites believed that *Jesus was only a man*—that they did not believe that *the Christ had at all come*—and that they *rejected the books in our New Testament*, I request the attention of my reader

(15) Quare non accipis Testamentum Vetus? quia & omne vas plenum superfusa non recipit, sed affundit.—Proinde & Judæi ex præoccupatione Moyseos Testamento veteri satiati, respuerunt novum. Faust. l. v. cap. 1. Lard. vol. iii. p. 496; former edit. vol. vi. p. 312.

whilst I lay before him a succinct, a clear, and, I trust an accurate account of the principal heresies which sprung up among Christians for the first three centuries after Christ; inasmuch as I have been able to collect it from the writings of the moderns. This is a subject wrapt up in more than Egyptian darkness. Every writer that I am acquainted with having no accurate ideas upon the subject, his language of course must be self-contradictory, which very frequently is the case. As the subject is uncommonly curious, and has exercised in vain the intellect of the first scholars, no farther preface is necessary. If what I have to offer upon this head should not prove perfectly satisfactory, as not being immediately deduced from the writings of the ancients, at least it will have that of novelty to recommend it; but first I shall premise one point, that, at present, I shall not adduce proofs for what is *generally*, and, for aught I know, universally admitted; presuming that I shall have few readers of these sheets, who will see any necessity for them; but in the Dissertation prefixed to my Harmony, I shall deem it my duty to prove every thing by *explicit evidence* from the ancient fathers of what I shall there propose.

My

My first position then is, that the appellation of Nazarene was the universal distinguishing name for *all* the followers of Jesus; that is, of those who believed in his divine mission. This was the genus which embraced all the species. As the term Protestant includes Lutherans, Calvinists, Arminians, Quakers; so did the term Nazarene include every sect of the followers of Jesus, whether Ebionites, Orthodox, Gnostics, &c. My proof for this position is from Acts xxiv. 5: "For we have found this Man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes." I doubt not but that there are some who will affirm that Nazarenes here intends only the Jewish believers in Jesus; but the following passage from Tertullian, will not admit this evasion. He says, that "the Christ of the Creator was to have been called a Nazarene, according to the prophet; wherefore the Jews call us Nazarenes, from this name¹⁶." This, I trust, is *explicit evidence*; if it be not, I know not what is.

Nazarenes

A. D.
230.

¹⁶ Nazaræus vocari habebat secundum Prophetiam Christus creatoris, unde & ipso nomine nos Judæi Nazaræos appellari per eum. Ad Marconem, lib. iv. cap. 8.

Tertullian was *no* Jew, yet he admits that *he* was called a *Nazarene* by the Jews. That it was a name of contempt, Bp. Horsley himself admits, which precludes any argument that can be formed from a different mode of spelling it; it being utterly improbable that the Jews would give the believers in Jesus two nick-names of nearly similar sound.

Orthodox. In the beginning of the second century, as I presume —for it can only be guessed at, there being no explicit evidence on either side, of what I am now going to propose, with respect to the Orthodox; some of these Nazarenes took it into their heads that, Jesus was the promised Messiah, *the Anointed*; which, in Greek, is Christos. These were the origin of the orthodox believers. Others of the Nazarenes, chiefly converts from among the

Valentini-
ans. Platonists, asserted, that the Christ was not *at all the Messiah of the Jews* (for they entirely rejected the Old Testament), but the Platonic Logos, by whose instrumentality the Platonists had before taught that God had made the world; but when made converts to christianity, they laid aside this notion of the Logos, having been the maker of the world, and affirmed that it was Jehovah, the God of the Jews,

who

who made it; and that it was owing to his *want of wisdom and power*, that the *origin of evil* was to be *ascribed* (for to account for this was the primary object of the Gnostic speculations); and that therefore the Omnipotent Father, or Great God of all, sent his Logos, that is the Platonic Logos, into the body of the Man Jesus, at the time of his baptism, in order that it might direct Him, in teaching and shewing unto man, in what manner they were to conduct themselves, in order to procure for their *souls* a future happy state. As the Gnostics were thus evidently and avowedly teaching a second god, superior to the Jehovah, the God of the Jews, whom the Orthodox have ever held (be their language what it may, to be *the only true God*), they most violently opposed these Gnostics sentiments, insisting that there was a Logos in Jesus; but yet that it was nothing more than the Logos of the Father Himself: and therefore, however in words they might seem to hold two Gods, they have always disavowed it. However this may be, in process of time the Christians worshipped Christ, thinking Him a God. Of this we are assured by Celsus: though I think it probable,

bable, from the defence of Origen, that these were only ignorant persons, and not the learned Christians. *V. Origen Cont. Cels. lib. iii. p. 131; also Comment. in Johan. vol. ii. p. 9,—Hist. Op. vol. iii. p. 263.*

The ancients affirm, and which I shall elsewhere prove to be the fact, that this heresy sprung up in the beginning of the reign of Adrian, who began his reign in the year 117: so I shall place, for the sake of round numbers, its origin in the year 120; and will distinguish this sect of the Gnostics by the name of Valentinians, from Valentine, one of the first who preached it.

Marcionites. Matters continued in this state, between the Orthodox and the Gnostics, till about the year 145, when Marcion is said by his followers (*Tert. p. 374, c.*) to have made his appearance in Rome, and to have taught nearly the same notions with the Valentinians, excepting only that they denied the *real* body of Jesus; affirming, that the Christ of the Valentinians descended from heaven, in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, with a *seeming* body. Thence they acquired the name of Docetæ, that is, *seemers*. He besides taught that Jehovah, the God of the Jews, was
a male-

a *malevolent* Being, and to this quality, and to *matter*, he ascribed the origin of evil.

These two sects, of Valentinian and Marcionite Christians, by their writings and numbers gave the Orthodox Christians much trouble; and, if we are to believe the fathers themselves, they were far more numerous than the Orthodox: when, about 130 years after, Manes made his appearance, Manichees. who taught, with Marcion, that Christ had only a *seeming* body, and, of course, that his passion was only a *seeming* one: and he thus accounted for the *origin of evil*.—He supposed that the devil and his angels sprung up into being from the tumultuous and irregular motion of matter, which he taught to be *far distant* from the realms of light, where the all-good and perfect Deity resided: that, upon the devil's making inroads into his realms, the all-perfect Deity sent one of the superior intelligences, who assumed *the appearance of a man*, and was accompanied by many others to restrain the devils, and so to arrange matters, that, in future, the realms of light should be no more disturbed with their inroads. These superior intelligences were opposed, and, in the first conflict, defeated; the devils having even seized a part
of

of their leader. This part, mixing with a portion of their own evil spirit, they infused into a human body, made by them, after the likeness of the leader of the angels with whom they had their late conflict; and thence the *origin of the good and evil propensities*, which we are all conscious of.

These three sects of Christians were, by the Orthodox, named Gnostics; because, as I apprehend, they wished to develope, or account for, the *cause* of the evil, almost universally admitted to prevail in the world.—The word Gnostic, signifies Knower, being derived from the Greek word *ginosko*—to know. So that Gnostic is the generic term which includes these three its chief sects; for there were several others who taught something intermediate between the Valentinians and the Marcionites, and between the Marcionites and the Manicheans. All Gnostic Christians, of whatever kind, denied the *resurrection of the body*, and were enemies to the *propagation of the human species*—and, rejecting the Old Testament, denied the omnipotency of the Jehovah of the Jews.

I own, that inasmuch as a careful perusal of the New Testament enables me to judge, I cannot
avoid

avoid being of the opinion that the Gospel of John and Luke, and Matthew, were expressly composed in *the order here mentioned* against the Gnostics; and to shew that this notion is not so bold, as to some it may appear to be, I shall here adduce a passage from Faustus, in his controversy with Augustine, in justification of the Manichees, for selecting some parts of the New Testament, which they admitted, and rejecting the remainder—" And how much
 " more allowable is it, says he, for us to take this
 " method, since it is certain that the New Testa-
 " ment was *not* written by Christ himself, nor by
 " his *apostles*, but *a long while after* their time, by
 " some *unknown* persons; who, lest they should not
 " be credited, when they wrote of affairs they were
 " *little* acquainted with, affixed to their works the
 " names of *apostles*, or of such as were *supposed* to
 " have been their *companions*, and saying that they
 " were written by them(17)." In my Harmony, I

(17) Præsertim quod nec ab ipso scriptum constat, nec ab ejus apostolis sed longo post tempore a quibusdam incerti nominis viris, qui ne sibi non haberetur fides, scribentibus quæ nescirent, partim apostolorum, partim eorum qui apostolos secuti viderentur, scriptorum suorum frontibus indiderunt, asseverantes secundum eos se scripsisse quæ scripserunt. Faust. lib. xxxii. cap. 2.—Lard. vol. iii. p. 515, n. d; form edit. vol. vi. p. 355.

shall attempt to point out those passages which have induced me also to be of this notion. I shall only here observe, that, if what Faustus asserts be true, and which Augustine does not controvert, the persons, who composed these Gospels, were somewhat unlucky in affixing the names; for excepting John the Baptist, and John the Evangelist, (the former whose existence I deny, as well as the latter's, the reasons for which shall appear in the Dissertation to my Harmony), they are the only Jews, whom I have met with, who were thus called; Matthew is a name equally unknown among the Jews—as for Mark and Luke, they are evidently Roman and Greek names, totally unknown among the Jews—and when it is considered that the apostles were of the lowest class of people, amongst which the common names are most usual, it must appear strange indeed, that the *four* evangelists should be distinguished by names scarcely known among their countrymen. With the same view to confute the Valentinians, I presume that the thirteen Epistles of St. Paul were composed: that to the Hebrews I do not deem to be his, the reasons for which will appear in the following sheets.

The

The first epistle of John is evidently, and I believe is universally admitted, to have been, written against the Docetæ; and consequently, must have been composed after the rise of this Sect, or *forty-five years after* the death of John.

I doubt not however that there are many of the orthodox, who will join with Bishop Horsely in affirming that the Apostles wrote *Proleptically*; but such an assertion being only an assumption should not be regarded, till those writings, namely the books which compose the New Testament, and which certainly refer to tenets unknown till the 2d century of the Christian Æra, are clearly shewn to have been in existence in the first. I know that Protestants understand 2. Thess. c. 2. v. 3. 4. as alluding to the future pretensions of the Roman Church. But who will dare affirm, that the Bishop of Rome ever pretended to exalt himself *above* God. This passage appears to me to allude to Marcion, who held that Jehovah, the object of worship both of Jews and Christians, was a finite Being; and that there

was

was another God infinitely his superior as Marcion taught. What farther strengthens this hypothesis is, that there is not a single tenet of Marcion, or of the Valentinian Gnostics, which is not clearly alluded to in St. Paul's Epistles: which to me is an evident proof that they were composed expressly against those tenets. His Lordship observes, Tracts p. 122, 123 that one of the Epistles of Ignatius was supposed by the great Bochart not to have been his, in consequence of the term *Leopardus* being found in it, as being, I presume, a term of a later age. This notion, he says, Pearson hath proved to be erroneous. For my part I shall give myself no trouble about this question, for till it is *proved* that the Apostles wrote *proleptically*, I shall conclude that every writing in which I find proleptic allusions is a spurious production of a later age. I wish also to know the difference between *proleptically* and *prophetically*, for if equivalent, and I acknowledge I see no essential difference between them, it will follow, that the primitive fathers

were

were prophets ! As I find that the *chronology of a word* forms an objection to the *antiquity* of a writing, I beg leave to know how it has happened, that the word *heresy* is found in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the Epistles of Paul, in a *bad* sense, half a century *before* there were any such people as heretics. The passages I allude to, are as follows : Acts xxiv. 5—14 ; “ We have found this man a
 “ pestilent fellow, and a ringleader of the *sect* [*heresy*]
 “ of the Nazarens. But this I confess unto you,
 “ that after the way which they call [*heresy*], so wor-
 “ ship I the God of my fathers, believing all things
 “ which are written in the law, and the prophets.”
 —xxviii. 22. “ As concerning this *sect* (*heresy*), we
 “ know that it is every where spoken against.”—
 Cor. xi. 19. “ For there must be *heresies* among you,
 “ that they which are approved may be made mani-
 “ fest among you.”—Gal. v. 20. “ Idolatry, witch-
 “ craft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife,
 “ seditions, *heresies*.”—Titus, iii. 10. “ A man that
 “ is a *heretic*, after the first and second admonition,
 “ reject.” I say, was it owing to this *proleptic* qua-
 lity, that we find that the terms *heresy* and *heretic*,
 or rather *sect* and *sectaries*, taken in a bad sense in
 these

these passages? possibly it will be said, that among the *Jews*, that there were Gnostic heretics in the apostolic age. This being asserted by critics of great name, as Mosheim, Mr. Gibbon*, Bp. Horsley, Dr. Priestley, and, I presume, every *systematic* writer upon the ancient heretics; for, in Lardner, I do not recollect the having met with this absurd notion, who only fairly lays before the reader the sentiments of the antients, and most celebrated moderns, respecting the antient heretics, without pretending to dogmatize upon the subject: to this uniform *assertion*, I shall answer by the *explicit testimony* of two celebrated antients. Firmilian, writing to Cyprian on the subject of re-baptizing heretics, in answer to one Stephanus, who urged a direction of the apostles to that purpose, replies, “ And, indeed, inasmuch as appertains to that which Stephanus hath said, as if the apostles prohibited them to be baptized, who came from *heresy*, and handed it down to posterity, that this (custom) was to be kept; you have most fully answered, that there can be no one *so foolish*, who can believe that the apostles delivered down this tradition, since even it is evident that these execra-

A. D.
233.

* They were *almost*, without exception, of the race of the Gentiles, vol. i. p. 550.

“ ble and detestable *heresies* sprung out *afterwards*.
 “ When also Marcion, the disciple of Cerdon, may
 “ be found late after the apostles, and in times much
 “ distant from them, to have introduced a profane
 “ tradition against God. Apelles also, consenting to
 “ his blasphemy, added many other new and heavier
 “ articles, inimical to the faith, and to the truth :
 “ but the age of Valentinus and Basilides is also mani-
 “ fest that they also, a long time after the apostles,
 “ rebelled against the church of God with their
 “ wicked lies. It is also evident, that the *other*
 “ *heretics* introduced their wicked heresies and per-
 “ verse innovations *afterwards*, as each was led by
 “ error ; all whom it is manifest are condemned by
 “ themselves, and have pronounced the inexcusable
 “ sentence against themselves before the day of judg-
 “ ment : the baptism of whom he who confirms,
 “ what else does he do then adjudge himself with
 “ them, and condemn himself, by making himself a
 “ partaker with such¹⁸.”. Again ; he says, “ More-
 “ over

¹⁸ Et quidem quantum ad id pertineat quod Stephanus dixit, quasi apostoli eos qui ab hæresi veniant baptizari prohibuerint, & hoc custodiendum posteris tradiderint ; plenissime vos respondistis, neminem tam stultum esse qui hoc credat apostolos tradidisse, quando etiam ipsas hereses

“ over, with the heretics and us, there is neither *one*
 “ God, nor *one* Lord, nor *one* church, nor *one* faith,
 “ nor *one* spirit, or *one* body: it is manifest that be-
 “ tween us and them there cannot be a common bap-
 “ tism, between whom there is nothing at all com-
 “ mon.” Cypriani Opera, vol. ii. p. 219—229—
 Hist. Op. vol. i. p. 294. This letter of Firmilian is
 only in a Latin translation, supposed to have been
 made by Cyprian himself; and its authority, I appre-
 hend, has never been disputed. In following passage

hereses constat excerabiles ac detestandas postea extitisse. Cum & Mar-
 cion Cerdonis discipulus inveniatur, sero post apostolos, & post longa
 ab eis tempora, sacrilegam adversus Deum traditionem induxisse. A-
 pelles quoque blasphemix ejus consentiens multa alia nova & graviora
 fidei ac veritati inimica addiderit. Sed & Valentini, & Basilidis tempus
 manifestum est quod & ipsi post apostolos & post longam ætatam, ad-
 versus ecclesiam dei sceleratis mendaciis suis rebellaverint. Ceteros quo-
 que hæreticos constat pravas suas sectas & inventiones perversas prout
 quisque errore ductus est, postea induxisse; quos omnes manifestum
 est a semetipsis damnatos esse, & ante dñem judicii inexcusabilem sen-
 tentiam adversus semetipsos dixisse: quorum baptisma qui confirmat,
 quid aliud quam cum ipsis se adjudicat, & se ipse participem talibus
 faciendo condemnat? Cypriani Opera, vol. ii. p. 219.—Hist. Op.
 vol. i. p. 294.

19 Porro cum nobis & hæreticis nec Deus unus sit, nec dominus
 unus, nec una ecclesia, nec fides una, sed nec unus spiritus. aut corpus
 unum; manifestum est nec baptisma nobis & hereticis commune esse
 posse, quibus nihil omnino commune. Cypriani Opera, vol. ii. p. 229.
 ---Hist. Op. ib.

Cyprian

Cyprian confirms the foregoing doctrine, where he says, "That no one ought to slander the apostles, as
 " if they approved of the baptisms [administered] by
 " heretics; or that they would communicate with
 " them without the baptism of the church, when the
 " apostles wrote such things" [that they should be
 shunned, &c. *V.* Rom. xvi. 17.—Tit. iii. 11.—
 2. Pet. iii. 17.] " of heretics: and this when the
 " more pestilential heresies had not as yet broke
 " forth²⁰:" alluding to the Valentinian Gnostics.

These passages shew what these writers thought of Gnostics in the apostolic age. I apprehend that the language of Firmilian justifies the term *absurd*, which I make use of: but, independently of what he says, I affirm, that a Jewish Gnostic is in itself an absurdity, or a self-contradictory proposition. For the object of the Gnostic speculation being to account for the origin of evil, the Gnostic ascribed it to the impotence, or malevolence of the Jehovah: and is it possible that *such a notion* could be entertained by a Jew? Did not the Deity himself declare unto Moses, Ex. xix. 9,

²⁰ Ut nemo infamare apostolos debeat, quasi illi hæreticorum baptismata probaverint; aut eis sine ecclesiæ baptismo communicaverint, quando talia de hæreticis apostoli scripserunt; & hoc cum nondum hæreticæ pestes aciores prorupissent, &c. Cypriani Epist. p. 211.

“ And the Lord said un^to Moses, Lo, I come unto thee in a thick cloud, that the people may hear when I speak with thee, AND BELIEVE THEE FOR EVER.” Now would they not have forgotten Moses had they believed the Jewish Jehovah was a *finite* Being, whereas HE assured them He was the INFINITE and ONLY GOD. I flatter myself that the learned reader will excuse the length, I fear tediousness, with which I have treated of these ancient and *first* heretics : but, besides, that I mean to avoid mentioning controversy in the Dissertation prefixed to my Harmony, as much as I well can, he must be sensible of the indispensable necessity of laying down clear, accurate, and true notions of the principal heresies which sprung up for the first three centuries, to enable common readers even at all to understand, much more to judge of, and to give them a relish or taste for writings which treat of them.

Sabellians.

The next heresy which I shall examine, is the Sabellian, thus called from Sabellius, who flourished about the middle of the third century. It is highly probable, that Praxeas, towards the end of the second century, and Noetus, in the beginning of the third, advanced notions which strongly approximated to the

Sabellian ;

Sabellian; but the heresy has taken its name from this latter bishop, who may have developed it in a clearer, and more plausible manner. Sabellius taught, that it was *not* the Logos which was embodied in Jesus, but *God Himself*; or rather a *portion* of the Deity, without being however *separated* from Him. To make this notion more obvious to the reader not conversant in these subjects, let him suppose the Deity to be a globe of flame, and that a part of this flame protends, or stretches itself out, without separating from the globe. This portion, they taught, occupied the body of the Man Jesus, and enabled him to speak in the manner he did, and to perform the works which He performed: this portion, they also taught, forsook Him before his passion, and was reformed into the Globe, or Deity. They also taught that the Holy Spirit was, in like manner, a protension, or protensions of a similar nature, as was that which occupied Jesus; but that this occupied the minds of the apostles of Jesus, and those others to whom the Deity Himself chose to impart it. This doctrine, as *destroying* the *personality* of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, was most violently attacked by the Orthodox. The bustle which it gave rise

to, is at present inconceivable; which terminated by the calling a council of bishops, who pronounced the doctrine to be *heretical*, and *deposed* the bishop.

The Orthodox, in their controversy with the Sabellians, must have been reduced to great difficulties. For, before Sabellius had taught the *consubstantiality*, or that the Father and the Son were of the *same substance*, the Orthodox had also themselves taught the *consubstantiality*, and that the Father and the Son, tho' *not* separate, were *two* persons. Hence the Sabellians thus argued—that if the Father and the Son were of the *same* substance, and were not *separated*, it must follow, that with regard to *substance*, that the Son's must be of the *same nature* as the Father's; and, if *not* separated, their mode or manner of union, could only be accounted for in the same, or some other like manner, as that which they supposed; and as all were agreed that the *substance* of the *Father* could *not* suffer, it followed of course, that that portion of the Deity communicated to Jesus, *according to them*, at the time of his baptism, must have departed from Him before his passion; for otherwise it would have suffered, which was absurd, the Father
being

being *impassible*. On the other hand, the Orthodox maintained, that as the scriptures had *expressly* declared, that Christ, or *the Son had suffered*, and that, as it was the *Logos* in Jesus, which constituted Him *the Son*, it followed of course, that the *Logos did positively suffer*; and therefore, if what the Sabellians asserted was true, that it was a *portion of the Father's substance*, occupying the Man Jesus, which constituted Him *the Son*, it followed of course that *the Father suffered*; which, being absurd, could not be the truth. The Orthodox, moreover, to evade the unanswerable arguments of the Sabellians, in proof of the truth of their sentiments from the *consubstantiality*, or *sameness of the substance of the Father and Son*, and of their *not being separated*, heretofore held by themselves, denied the *consubstantiality*; affirming, that the Son was *inferior* to the Father, and therefore was *passible*. As this sentiment is so directly contrary to modern orthodoxy, I think it necessary to prove it by the following explicit evidence from Origen and Novatus. In his Commentaries upon the Scriptures, Origen says, “ We say that the Saviour and Holy Spirit are
 “ so much *surpassed*, and even *more* by the Father,
 “ than he [the Saviour] and the Holy Spirit surpass
 “ all

“ all other things: nevertheless, though surpassing so
 “ many and such great things in substance, in pri-
 “ ority, in power, in deity (for he is the living
 “ Logos), and in wisdom, he is *in nothing to be com-*
*pared to the Father*²¹”. Origen says, in his tract *De*
Oratione, “ If we understand what prayer is, we must
 “ *never* pray to any created being, *not to Christ*
 “ himself; but to the *one* God and Father of the
 “ whole, to whom even our Saviour himself prayed,
 “ as we have already shewn²².” This passage proves
 that, in the time of Origen, the *Saviour* was NOT
 prayed to by any Orthodox Christians: the word WE,
 necessarily including all such. Novatus says, “ it was
 “ so evidently delivered in the Scriptures [I presume
 “ the New Testament] that He [Jesus] was God,

²¹ Ου Συμμερισει, ἀλλ’ υπερβαλλουσα υπεροχη φαμεν τον σω-
 τηρα, κ’ το πνευμα το αγιον, υπερεχομενον, τωσβιον η κ’, ωλεον απα-
 τε πατρις οσω υπερεχει αυλος κ’ το αγιον πνευμα των λοιπων, ε-
 των τυχοντων Αλλ’ ομως των τοσαυτων κ’ τηλικωτων υπερεχων υσια,
 κ’ πρεσβεια, κ’ δυναμει, κ’ θειοτητι (εμφυχος γαρ εστι λογος) κ’
 σοφια ε Συγκρινηται κατ’ εδεν τω πατρι. Comment. vol. ii. p. 218.
 Hist. Op. vol. ii. p. 158.

²² Εαν δε ακηωμεν οτε ποτε εστι προσευχη, μηποτε εδενι των
 γεννητων προσευκτεον εστιν, ε δε αυτω τω Χριστω. Αλλα μονω τω
 θεω και πατρι, ω κ’ αυλος ο σωτηρ ημων προσηυχαιο ως προπαρεθη-
 μεθα De Oratione.---Hist. Op. vol. ii. p. 161.

“ that

“ that many of the heretics moved (or astonished)
 “ with the greatness and the truth of his Deity,
 “ *unmeasurably extending his honours*, have dared to
 “ advance, or to think, that he was not the Son,
 “ but God the Father Himself²³.” Things continued for some time in this state between the Orthodox and Sabellians ; when

Arius, reflecting upon the controversy, advanced an Arius,
 opinion which created even more noise in the world than that of Sabellius—was very widely spread—was, and is still, embraced by many learned men, and amongst its followers can reckon a pope and emperors. Arius thus argued—If, as the Orthodox affirm, the Son is *not consubstantial*, or of the *same substance* with the Father, he must be of a *different substance*, and if of a *different substance*, he must have been created *in time* (that is, he was *not* eternal, for, except the Father, Christians denied the eternity of all other substances) ; and if created *in time*, and as

23 Usque adeo manifestum est in Scripturis esse Deum tradi, ut plerique hæreticorum, divinitatis ipsius magnitudine & veritate commoti, ultra modum extendentes honores ejus, ausissent non filium sed ipsum Deum patrem promere vel putare. Cap. xviii. A.—Hist. Op. vol. ii. p. 166.

he was not of the *same* substance as the Father, He must have been created out of *nothing*; for the Scriptures expressly affirm, that the Son is the first born of all creatures, which is only another name for substances. As this reasoning was conclusive against the Orthodox, in consequence of their denying, in their controversy with the Sabellians, the *consubstantiality*, or sameness of nature, of the Father and Son—to support themselves against the Arians, and to repel those conclusive arguments—they were necessitated to *re-affirm* the *consubstantiality* of the Father and Son; which was, in fact, acknowledging themselves *patripassians*, or that the substance of the Father suffered, which they had before affirmed to be an absurdity. The Orthodox were perfectly sensible of the difficulties to which they were reduced between the Arians and Sabellians, and which the following passage from Hilary sufficiently evinces—“ But I am always in danger—I am always
 “ in fear either of falling into streights, or into
 “ caverns, or of being entangled in snares: for when
 “ I preach according to the law, and to the prophets,
 “ and to the apostles, that there is but ONE God,
 “ Sabellius is upon me, devouring me entirely upon
 “ the

“ the acknowledgment of THIS WORD, as much
 “ desired meat” [as if then preaching agreeably to
 his own sentiments]. “ Again, when I deny,
 “ against Sabellius, that there is *one* God, and ac-
 “ knowledge that the Son of God is the true God,
 “ the new heresy [Arianism] awaits me, and affirms
 “ that two Gods are preached by me²⁴.” Arius’s
 heresy then was, the affirming that the Son was
 created out of NOTHING, and in TIME, i. e. that
 He was not ETERNAL. The Arians were taxed
 with polytheism by the Orthodox, as worshipping a
 SECOND GOD, differing from the Father, as not
 being of the SAME substance; and also with idolatry,
 as worshippers of *a creature*.

Shortly after the rise of Sabellianism, about the Humanists.
 middle of the third century, there sprung up ano-

²⁴ Mihi vero, aut in angustias decidere, aut in defossa incidere, aut
 plagis illa queari semper in Periculo semper in metu est. Predicatur
 enim secundem Legem, & prophetas & apostolos unum deum, adest
 mihi Sabellius, totum me sub hujus verbi professione, tanquam deside-
 ratum cibum, morsu sævissimo transvorans. Negantem me rursus,
 contra Sabellium, unum Deum, & consentem verum deum, dei filium,
 expectat nova hæresis, & a me duos deos ac prædicari. De Trinitate,
 lib. vii. p. 131.---Hist. Op. vol. iii. p. 341---Hist. Op. vol. iv.
 p. 222.

ther heresy, which I shall distinguish by the name of Humanism; a term, I believe, first introduced into our language by the ingenious and learned Mr. Howes, as being expressive of the sentiment. The *first* proposer of this sentiment was Paul, Bp. of Samosate, who was followed by Photinus, Bp. of Sirmium, two men of rare abilities. Their sentiment was, that Jesus was a *mere* man, without any participation at all of Deity. They also held that Jesus was the Christ. In this, and acknowledging the Scriptures of the New Testament, they differed from the Ebionites, or rather the Double Ebionites. Paul and Photinus were adjudged heretics, and deposed, for insisting that their sentiment was *proveable* from the Scriptures of the New Testament; whereas the Ebionites, who did not acknowledge these writings, nor gave themselves any trouble about them, were *never* called HERETICS till *after* the council of Nice, A.D. 325.—The reader will perceive, that the *test* of heresy I make to be the interpreting the New Testament differently from the Orthodox; and that this sentiment is well founded, the following passages from Ambrosiaster, or Hilary, and Jerome, afford *explicit evidence*

dence—Bp. Horsley's *Sine qua non*, or *only* proof of the truth of every sentiment attributed to the antients.

—Ambrosiaster, or rather Hilary, Deacon of Poitiers, says, “They are heretics who, by the words
“ of the law, fight against the law; for they su-
“ peradd their own *peculiar* meaning to the words of
“ the law, that they may recommend the depravity
“ of their own minds by the authority of the law²⁵.”

Jerome says, that “all heretics do this, setting forth
“ their impieties under the name of Christ, by sup-
“ porting their own errors and lies with the testi-
“ mony of the scriptures²⁶.” The justness of the sentiment is also proved by fact: for were not the Sabellians—was not Paul of Samosate—was not Arius—was not Photinus—excommunicated, though they, and each of them, alledged the scriptures in their several defences; and therefore, to prove that

²⁵ Hæretici hi sunt, qui per verba legis legem impugnant: proprium enim sensum verbis adstruunt Legis, ut pravitatem mentis suæ, legis auctoritate commendent. Ad. Tit. cap. iii. v. 10, 11.---Lard. vol. ix. p. 254, n. f.---Hist. Her. 46.

²⁶ Hoc faciunt omnes hæretici, Christiano nomine fornicantes, & erroribus suis atque mendaciis obtendentes testimonia scripturarum. Hieron. in Amos, cap. ii. p. 1384.---Lard. vol. ix. p. 253, n. n.---Hist. Her. vol. . p. 45.

their opinions were erroneous, general councils were assembled to determine respecting the *true* sense of scripture. This was totally unnecessary with regard to the Gnostics, who avowedly denied, or partially received, the scriptures. With regard to the Ebionites, it was equally unnecessary; for they entirely disregarded our Canon of Scripture, and therefore could impose no erroneous sense to it. There is another test of heresy mentioned by Athanasius; who says, “The heretics make to themselves “ *another* Maker of the universe, besides the Father “ of our Lord Jesus Christ²⁷.” Now the heretics who held *another* Maker were the Arians, and Gnostics, and not the Ebionites, who, in this respect, thought as Athanasius himself. It therefore follows, from what Ambrosiaster, or rather Hilary, and Jerome, and Athanasius say, that the Ebionites could not by the Orthodox, as a body, be deemed, however odious their peculiar opinions might be to individuals, heretics. Moreover, as all heretics were expelled the

²⁷ Οἱ δὲ ἀπο τῶν αἵρεσιων ἄλλον εαυτοῖς ἀνοπλατῶσαι δημιουργὸν τῶν πάντων παρὰ τὸν πατέρα τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ. De Incarnatione.---Opera, vol. i. p. 55.---Second Letter to Hosiery, p. 82.

church, their mixing in the congregations of the faithful also shews that they were *not* esteemed heretics. That *all* heretics were expelled the church, appears from Jerome; who says, "For every heretic
 " is born *in* the church, but is expelled *from* the
 " church; and quarrels and fights with the church (28)."
 Now that the Ebionites frequented, or attended the meetings of the faithful (the Catholics), appears evident from the following passages from Tertullian and Origen. Tertullian says, that "forasmuch as unguarded
 " [people], that I may not call them imprudent, and
 " persons in no official capacity, which is always the
 " greatest part of believers, because that the rule itself of
 " the faith [or because that the rule itself] transfers our
 " belief from the many gods of the world, to the only
 " *one* and *true* God; not understanding that the only *one*
 " God is to be believed indeed, but with his *æconomy*,
 " are greatly afraid at the *æconomy*. They con-
 " ceive that the number and division of the Trinity,
 " [to be] a division of the Unity; seeing that Unity,

28 Omnis emin hæreticus nascitur Ecclesia, sed de ecclesia projicitur :
 & contendit, & pugnat contra ecclesiam. In Jerem. cap. xxii. p. 631.
 —Lard. vol. ix. p. 227. n. m.—Hist. Her. p. 6.

" producing

“ producing *Trinity* from itself, may not be destroy-
 “ ed, but is served by it. Therefore they already
 “ give out, that two and three [Gods] are confessed by
 “ us; but they affirm themselves [to be] worshippers
 “ of the *one* God. As if Unity irrationally con-
 “ ceived, may not make a heresy; [and] Trinity
 “ rationally comprehended, may not constitute truth.
 “ They say, We hold the monarchy. Thus also the
 “ Latins, even the rustics, express aloud the sound.
 “ that you may think that they understand the *mo-*
 “ *narchy* as well as they pronounce it. But the
 “ Latins study to resound the monarchy; even the
 “ Greeks are unwilling to understand the œcono-
 “ my (29).” Monarkia and œconomia being both Greek

(29) Simples enim quique, ne dixerim imprudentes, & idiotæ, quæ
 major semper credentium pars est, quoniam & ipsa regula fidei a pluri-
 bus diis seculi, ad unicum & deum verum transfert; non intelligentes
 unicum quidem, sed cum sua œconomia esse credendum expavescunt ad
 œconomiam. Numerum & dispositionem trinitatis, divisionem præsu-
 munt unitatis; quando Unitas ex semet ipsa derivans trinitatem, non
 destruat ab illa, sed administratur. Itaque duos & tres jam jactitant
 a nobis prædicari, se vero unius dei cultores præsumunt.——Quasi non
 & unitas irrationaliter collecta, hæresim faciat, trinitas rationaliter ex-
 pressa, veritatem constituat. Monarchiam, inquiunt, tenemus. Et ita
 sonum vocaliter expremunt etiam Latini, etiam opici, ut putes illos
 tam bene intelligere monarchiam, quem enunciant. Sed monarchiam
 sonare student Latini, œconomiam intelligere nolunt etiam Græci. ad.
 Præeam, Hist. Op. vol. iii. p. 266.

terms;

terms, the meaning therefore is, that the Latins were so intent upon this business of the Unity, that they learned the Greek term expressive of it, which they were accustomed to shout out ; whilst that the Greeks were unwilling even to understand their *own* language (*œconomia*), which was employed in explaining the mystery. I think this passage (the original I mean) paints the sentiments, and shews the excessive unpopularity of the *mystery* in very lively colours. Origen says, “ And we ought to know
 “ this, that as the law affords the shadow of good
 “ things to come, which appears when the law is
 “ expressed agreeably to the truth : thus also the
 “ gospel teaches the shadow of the mysteries of
 “ Christ, as it is understood by the *generality* ; but
 “ that which John calls the *everlasting* gospel, which
 “ may properly be called the *spiritual*, very clearly
 “ teaches the *intelligent* all things respecting the Son
 “ of God. Wherefore it is necessary to christianize
 “ [or preach Christ] *spiritually* and *corporeally* ; and
 “ when we should preach the corporeal gospel, this
 “ must be done, saying to the carnal, that we know
 “ nothing but Jesus Christ, and Him crucified : but
 “ when

“ when we find persons strengthened in the Spirit,
 “ and bringing forth fruit in it, being in love with
 “ heavenly wisdom, we must impart unto them of
 “ the Logos, returning from his bodily state, into
 “ that in which he was in the beginning with God³⁰.”

This passage shews that there was nothing in the communion service repugnant to the feelings of the *generality*, who only acknowledged the *corporeal* gospel, or Jesus Christ, and Him crucified. And that things continued in this state for a century after Origen, is evident from the disputes of Basil, surnamed the Great, with his flock; who forced him from his church, and compelled him to quit his diocese, for

³⁰ Καὶ τέλος δε εἶδεναι ἐχρην, οἱ ὡς περ ἐστὶ νομος σκίαν παρέχων τῶν μελλόντων αγαθῶν, ὑπο τῆ κατ' ἀληθείαν καὶ ἀγαγέλλομεν νομῶν δηλωμένων, εἶω καὶ, εὐαγγέλιον σκίαν μυστηρίων Χριστοῦ διδάσκει, τοιοῦτον ὑπὸ πάντων ἐνυγχανόντων νοεῖσθαι. Οὕτως φησὶν Ἰωάννης εὐαγγέλιον αἰώνιον, οἰκειῶς ἀν' ἐκείνου πνευματικόν, σαφὲς παρίσχει τοῖς νομοῖς τὰ πάντα ἐνώπιον περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ. Διὸ περ ἀναγκαῖον πνευματικῶς καὶ σωματικῶς Χριστιανίζειν* καὶ ὅπως μὲν χρὴ τὸ σωματικόν κηρύσσειν εὐαγγέλιον, φασκόντα μηδὲν εἶδεναι τοῖς σαρκικοῖς ἢ Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν καὶ τέλος ἐσαυτομόνον, τέλος ποιήσαν. ἔπειτα δὲ εὐρεθῶσι κατηρτισμένοι τῷ πνεύματι, καὶ καρποφορήτες ἐναυτίῳ, ἐρῶντες τῇ θείᾳ σοφίᾳ μετὰ δόξαν αὐτοῖς τῶν λόγων, ἐπαυελθόντες ἐφ' ὃ ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν. Comment. in Johan. vol. ii. p. 9 --- Hist. Op. vol. iii. p. 263.

insisting

insisting to introduce his novelties into the service of the church. Mosheim observes, and whose authority with many will weigh much, and, I think, deservedly, with regard to the *simple statement of facts*, that “however ready many have been to embrace
 “this erroneous doctrine, it does not appear that this
 “sect formed to themselves a separate place of wor-
 “ship, or *removed themselves from the ordinary assem-*
“ blies of Christians.” If this be fact, and the above passages from Tertullian and Origen prove that it is, these *corporeal* believers were not deemed heretics. It having been already proved, that all the *corporeal* believers were Ebionites, or Double Ebionites, except the followers of Paul of Samosate, and Photinus; it follows, that neither the Ebionites nor Double Ebionites were deemed heretics; for in that case they would have been *expelled* (V. n. 28.); which shews that there was an *essential* difference, though hitherto *unobserved* I apprehend, between them, and the followers of Paul and Photinus, who were expelled. A very obvious question offers itself here; which is, How came it to pass, that if the Ebionites, or Double Ebionites, composed the greater part of the body of Christians, that they should have suffered to be introduced into the

church service, such forms of prayer as ought necessarily to have excluded themselves from resorting to the usual places of worship, if truly religiously conscientious men? and also, how happened it, that in a very short time after Basil, that they became so *few* from being the *generality*, or *majority*, as to be but little noticed? To the first I answer, that after the accession of Theodosius the Great, in the latter end of the fourth century, all Christians that were not of the Orthodox faith suffered a most violent persecution from the reigning powers in church and state. Unjust laws were made against them—similar to those against the Catholics in these kingdoms in the reign of Elizabeth, &c. and against the Hugonots in France, in the reign of Lewis XIV.—their places of worship were shut up; so that if they did *not* join in worship with the Orthodox, they must have done without any worship at all: a situation by no means supportable, it would seem, to mortals anywise enlightened. This alone must, in a little time, have reduced the numbers of the Ebionites very much. To the second I answer, that it appears from history, that the followers of Jesus, of whatever denomination, were but a very
small

small part of the people, compared to the whole. Mr. Gibbon supposes, and I believe he is not singular, that before the conversion of Constantine, they did not compose more than a twentieth part of the whole of the Roman subjects. Then there remaining nineteen parts of the whole Roman people Heathens, when their temples were shut up, or rather pulled down, in the reign of the great and *pious* Theodosius, they must have done without exterior worship, if they did not join the Orthodox (for other Christian sects were equally persecuted by him as the Heathens), and which we may suppose that they did, as they could have but few qualms of conscience; and in a couple of generations they became *good Orthodox Christians*; not only persecuting the religion of their forefathers, but even those who differed an iöta from themselves—precisely as has happened in this good orthodox kingdom of Britain. When these causes are considered, it will no longer appear surprising that the Ebionites nearly vanished; for at no time did they bear any proportion that signifies to the great body of the people, now become Orthodox Christians: however, that they existed in Gaul, in the time of Cassian, in

the beginning of the fifth century, we have his *explicit evidence*. It is supposed by the learned, and which I think very probable, that the few of their descendants who retained *something* of their pristine belief, when become an object of jealousy to the Papal power, by not implicitly receiving its dogmas, and of course were thought worthy of extirpation, appeared under the names of Pataræ, Albigenes, &c.

Hitherto I have said nothing directly as to the antiquity of the Ebionites; but it may be easily concluded, from the quotations from Origen, that the sect had existed some considerable time before he wrote: in fact, the antients always express themselves as if it had existed in the apostolic age. I shall take no advantage here of what the author of *The Little Labyrinth* says, by some ascribed to Caius, who is generally admitted to have flourished in the beginning of the third century. The author of this work, I presume, and I think I can prove, wrote about the middle of the third century; but his having, as I apprehend, put out his works in the name of another, and so imposing upon mankind, totally disqualifies him from being an evidence that
can

can be relied on. However, as others may think differently, I shall cite him, as translated by Lardner, vol. ii. p. 381; former edit. p. 39. He says, “The
 “ design of the first passage of this work is to shew
 “ the novelty of that heresy—that our Saviour was
 “ born a mere man—whereas the persons against
 “ whom he writes *asserted* its *antiquity*. For they
 “ say that *all* the antients, and even the apostles
 “ *themselves*, received and taught the *same* things
 “ which they *now* hold: and that the truth of the
 “ gospel was preserved till the time of Victor, the
 “ thirteenth bishop of Rome from Peter: but by his
 “ successor (or, from the time of his successor) Ze-
 “ phirinus, the *truth* has been corrupted. And pos-
 “ sibly what they say might be credited, if, first of
 “ all, the divine scriptures did *not* contradict them;
 “ and then also, secondly, the writings of the
 “ brethren more antient than Victor, which they
 “ published in defence of the truth against the Gen-
 “ tiles, and against the heresies of their times.”

The next proof of its antiquity I shall adduce from Eusebius*, bishop of Cæsarea, who says, “That

* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. V. cap. xxviii. p. 195. O.

“ the

“ the heralds of our Saviour Himself called [them]
 “ Ebionites [that is], in the Hebrew tongue, *poor* ;
 “ thus marking their folly, for saying that they
 “ knew *one* God, and did not deny the body of the
 “ Saviour, but *not acknowledging his divinity*³¹.” As
 the two passages, this and the one ascribed to Caius,
 are in the works of Eusebius, they confirm one ano-
 ther. One would think that he knew nothing of the
 church of Orthodox Christians settled at Ælia, sub-
 sequent to the destruction of Jerusalem in the reign of
 Adrian ; which, according to Mosheim, Gibbon, and
 Bp. Horsley, gave rise to the Nazarene, and Ebionite,
 sects.

The reader, I apprehend, can now form a pro-
 per judgment respecting these believers ; sometimes
 called Ebionites, as by Origen and Eusebius ; *be-*
cause rejecting our books of the New Testament,
 they placed their *sole* hope on the *promises in the*

³¹ Καὶ αὖτις δὲ τῶ σωτήρος ἡμῶν πρῶτοκληρυκεῖς Ἐβιωναῖοις ὀνο-
 μαζόν, ἑβραϊκῇ φωνῇ Πλωχὺς τὴν διανοίαν ἀποκαλεῖσθαι τὴς ἐνὰ μὲν
 θεὸν λεγούσας εἰδέναι, καὶ τὸ σωτήρος τὸ σῶμα μὴ ἀρνημένους, τὴν
 δὲ τὴν οὐκ ἐκείνην μὲν εἰδούσας. Eccl. Theol. lib. I. cap. xiv. p. 75.
 ---Tracts, p. 148.---Hist. Op. vol. iii. p. 163.

law of Moses. All the Jewish believers in Jesus and some Gentile believers, are thus called by Origen—they are described as holding his being a *mere* man. Tertullian and Athanasius call such believers *Jews*; the latter particularly affirming, that they did not believe that the Christ had *at all* come. Theodoret affirms*, that the Hebrews held the same opinion respecting the *mere* manhood of Jesus. As to its antiquity, we have the testimony of Eusebius, added to all the Fathers of the three first centuries, that it existed in the apostolic age. Can we then doubt but that their faith was the genuine faith delivered by Jesus to his apostles, and by them to the world? Is not this farther confirmed by reflecting, that in the earliest Christian writings, I mean those ascribed to St. Paul, we find all the followers of Jesus called Nazarenes; and in the oldest of the Christian fathers, Tertullian, we find them distinguished by the same name and that in a manner which shews that it comprehended every believer in Jesus: which being a name given to his followers by the Jews, through contempt, as being the followers of a poor Nazarene, the universality of its application cannot be, nor do I believe

is

* Hær. Fab. b. ii. c. 3.

is, disputed. When all this is reflected on, and that by the fathers of the fourth century—the Ebionites and Nazarenes—are always grouped together—as if holding the same sentiments—when the learned Symmachus is said by some to have been an Ebionite—by others, that the Nazarenes were called Symmachians from him; Can it be doubted, that the Nazarenes and Ebionites were different appellations of persons professing the same religious opinions; and who held the *original, true, and pure* notion respecting Jesus; namely—that He was only a mere man, a prophet, and not the Christ. Am I to blame then for professing myself an Ebionite, a sect not taxed with heresy for three centuries and a half after Christ, which is more than can be said of any other of the sects. Moreover, when it is considered that all my proofs are taken (save one from Tertullian) from Christian writers of the present day, who certainly were not *lynx-eyed* in discovering what would overthrow their respective systems, it must surely be deemed a strong presumptive argument in favour of my theory, independently of its being so much within the comprehension of the ordinary capacity of man.

I have

I have said that Tertullian is the oldest of the Christian fathers: this I have no doubt to make evident to all those who will agree with me, that the fathers before him had not the gift of writing *proleptically*: but even independently of this I shall, upon other accounts, I trust be able to shake their credit—I mean their existence. Before I conclude this disquisition, it is necessary that I should prove, as having affirmed it, that the Sabellians were the *blasphemers* of Christ, and were thus *peculiarly* distinguished by the antients from other heretics—and that Paul of Samosate was the *first* proposer of the Humanist notion. The following passages, from Socrates, will prove the first point: who says, “ For those [the Arians], declining
 “ the word *consubstantial*, thought they who received it
 “ were introducing the opinions of Sabellius and Montanus, and therefore called them BLASPHEMERS,
 “ as taking away the subsistence and personality* of the
 “ Son of God. They [the Orthodox], on the other
 “ side, who were attached to [the word] *consubstantial*,
 “ thinking that the others [Arians] were introducing

* That this is the true meaning of *ὑπαρξίς* will be shewn in the second Part.

“ poly-

“ *polytheism*, charged them as introducing *heathenism* (32).” Here we see the *true* reason assigned, why the Sabellians were called *blasphemers*, for by taking away the subsistence, and personality of Christ, they annihilated his very Being; which from the opinions ascribed to them, we see to be well-founded, and with propriety could *only* be imputed to them. That *blaspheming* Christ could not, with any propriety at all be ascribed to the Gnostics, must be evident from the following passage of Augustine, in his letter to Volusian, where he says, “ because he was “ refreshed by sleep, and nourished by food, and “ was sensible of all the human affections. This assures “ men, that He was a man, whom therefore he did “ not put off, but put on. This is the fact. Nevertheless some heretics perversely admiring and praising his virtue [or power], are unwilling to acknowledge *at all* the human nature in Him, in which is the recommendation of all grace, by which He saves those that believe in Him; con-

(32) Οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὴν ὁμοῦσιν τὴν λέξιν ἐκκλινούσιν, τὴν Σαβελλίαν καὶ Μονίαν δοξάν εἰσηγεῖσθαι αὐτὴν τῆς προσδεχομένης ἐνομιζόν· καὶ δια τῆς βλασφημίας ἐκάλουν, ὡς ἀναιρησίας τὴν ὑπαρξίν τῆς υἱοῦ τῆς θεοῦ· οἱ δὲ πάλιν τῷ ὁμοῦσι προσκείμενοι, πολυθεϊαν εἰσαγεῖν τῆς εἰρᾶς ἐνομιζούσιν, ὡς ἐλληνισμὸν εἰσαγούσας ἐξείρεποντο. Hist. lib. I. cap. xxiii. p. 58.—Hist. Op. vol. iv. p. 206.

“ taining

“ taining the deep treasures of wisdom and know-
 “ ledge, and enduing us with faith, which may lead
 “ us to the eternal contemplation of the unchange-
 “ able truth. What, if the Omnipotent put on a
 “ man, otherwise formed than from the mother’s
 “ womb, and should introduce him suddenly to the
 “ sight [of mortals]? What, if he did not pass
 “ through the several stages from childhood to man-
 “ hood—that he neither eat nor slept—would it not
 “ strengthen the opinion of the error, and that He
 “ took upon him *true* man would not at all be be-
 “ lieved: and whilst he doeth every thing wonder-
 “ fully, he would take away what he hath done
 “ mercifully? But now the Mediator hath so ap-
 “ peared betwixt God and Man, that conjoining
 “ both natures in unity of person, he hath elevated
 “ what is ordinary with the extraordinary, and the
 “ extraordinary he hath tempered with the ordina-
 “ ry³³:” that is, the Deity elevated the man, and man

K 2

lowered

33 Jam illud quod in somnos solvitur, & cibo alitur, & omnes hu-
 manos sentit affectus, hominem persuadet hominibus quem non con-
 sumsit utique, sed assumsit. Ecce sic factum est, & tamen quidam hære-
 tici, perverse mirando, laudandoque ejus virtutem, naturam humanam
 in eo prorsus agnoscere noluerunt, ubi est omnis gratiæ commendatio,
 qua

lowered the Deity. I am aware that Irenæus charges the Gnostics with blasphemy, but with what little propriety the two above-cited passages shew; and prove him to have been utterly ignorant of the subject of which he treated; and of his extreme ignorance in this respect, I am supported by the ablest moderns who have considered the subject. *V. Lardner*, vol. ix. p. 230, n. c.—*History of Heretics*, p. 15. Moreover, where he thus speaks is in that part of his works, the original of which is lost; and of which we have only a poor Latin translation, supposed to be made in the latter end of the fourth century, and therefore but little dependance can be placed on it. But I also affirm, that were the passage to be found in the original Greek text, that it would

qua falvos facit credentes in se, profundos thesauros sapientiæ & scientiæ continens, & fide mentes induens, quas ad æternam contemplationem veritatis incommutabilis provehat. Quid si omnipotens ubicunque formatum non ex materno utero exarat, sed repentinum inferret aspectibus? Quid si nullas ex parvulo in juventam mutaret ætates, nullos cibos, nullos caperet somnos: nonne opinionem confirmaret erroris, nec hominem verum suscepisse, ullo modo crederetur. Et dum omnia mirabiliter facit, auferret quod misericorditer fecit? Nunc vero ita inter Deum & homines Mediator apparuit, ut in unitate personæ copulans utramque naturam, & solita sublimaret insolitis, & insolita solitis temperet. *Ad. Volusian Ep. 137. al. 3. numb. 9.*—*Lard. vol. ix. p. 189, n. m.; form. edit. Heathen Test. vol. iv. p. 441,*

prove

prove to them who do not acknowledge the *proleptic* quality of the primitive fathers, that the works ascribed to this father are all spurious, as containing notions *unknown* to the world for near half a century after his supposed time, and of which these *blasphemers* are a proof; for the *blaspheming* Sabellianism was not earlier known.

Having premised thus much, I shall examine the so-much-contested passage of Justin Martyr, between Bp. Horley, the late Mr. Badcock, and Dr. Priestley. Justin says, that “ there are and have been, my
 “ friends, many persons who, coming in the name
 “ of Jesus, have taught to say and do atheistical and
 “ blasphemous things; and by us they are distin-
 “ guished from the persons from whom each doc-
 “ trine and opinion originated (but others, accord-
 “ ing to another manner, teach to *blaspheme* the
 “ Maker of the universe, and the Christ that was
 “ foretold that would come from Him, even the
 “ God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob; with
 “ none of whom have we communication, know-
 “ ing them to be atheistical, and impious, and un-
 “ righteous, and lawless; and instead of *worshipping*
 “ Jesus, acknowledge Him in *name* only: and they
 “ call

“ call themselves Christians—in like manner as the
 “ Heathens inscribe the name of God on the works
 “ of their hands—and defile themselves with wicked
 “ and atheistical ceremonies): and some of them are
 “ called Marcionites; some Valentinians; some Basi-
 “ lideans, and some Saturnilians; and others by
 “ other names, each being called from the leader of
 “ the opinion ³⁴.”

Dr. Priestley affirms, that the blasphemers mentioned here are the Gnostics, which is directly contradicted by the passage just cited from Augustine; besides that the Doctor, in other parts of his writings, acknowledges, that the Gnostics, so far from intending to blaspheme

³⁴ Εἰσιν οὖν καὶ ἐγενοντο, ὡ φίλοι, ἄνδρες πολλοί, οἱ ἀθεῖα καὶ βλασφημία λεγέιν καὶ πρᾶττειν ἐδιδάξαν, ἐν ὀνομασίᾳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ προσελθόντες· καὶ εἰσιν υἱοὶ ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς προσωνυμίας τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐξ ὑπερῆκαστης διδασχῆ καὶ γνῶμης ἡρξάμενοι (ἄλλοι γὰρ καὶ ἄλλον τρόπον βλασφημεῖν τὸν ποιῆτην τῶν ὅλων, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ υἱοῦ προφητευόμενον ἐλευσεσθαι Χριστόν, καὶ τὸν θεὸν Ἀβραάμ, καὶ Ἰσαάκ, καὶ Ἰακώβ, διδάσκουσιν· ὡς ἔδει κοινωθέντες, οἱ γνωρίζοντες ἀθεῖας, καὶ ἀσεβεῖς, καὶ ἀδίκους, καὶ ἀνομίαν αὐτῆς υπαρχούσας, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ σέβειν, ὀνομασίᾳ ὁμολογεῖν· καὶ Χριστιανὰς εἰσὶν λέγουσιν, οὐν τρόπον, οἱ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγραφῶσι τοῖς χειροποιήτοις, καὶ ἀνομίαις, καὶ ἀθεοῖς τελεταῖς κοινῶσι) καὶ εἰσιν αὐτῶν οἱ μὲν τινες καλούμενοι Μαρκιανοί, οἱ δὲ Οὐαλεντινιανοί, οἱ δὲ Βασιλιδεῖς, οἱ δὲ Σατορνιλιανοί, καὶ ἄλλοι ἄλλῳ ὀνομασίᾳ, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχηγῆς τῆς γνώμης ἑκάστος ὀνομαζόμενος. Dial. p. 208.—Hist. Op. vol. i. p. 271.

Christ, had only his *exaltation* in view. This notion is the more singular in the Doctor, as he presumes throughout his writings, that the deityship of Christ was continually *gaining* ground, and of course it should not have been extravagantly high in Justin's supposed time. The bishop and Mr. Badcock suppose that Justin here intends the Ebionites; and I acknowledge that I myself was of this sentiment; as it appeared to me absurd that the Gnostics should be called *blasphemers* of Christ who sought *only* to exalt Him, till I was convinced of my error by the above passage, p. 66, from that judicious historian Socrates (for this is his character among the learned). What I have just mentioned shews into what errors men run when they begin to speculate, and form hypotheses; for I apprehend that few will dispute the learning and ingenuity of the above gentlemen; and it also shews the necessity of requiring *explicit* testimony from the ancients in support of every assertion respecting their opinions. But it may be, that notwithstanding what I have alledged, that the learned bishop may continue to be of his own opinion, and affirm, that they are the Ebionites to whom Justin alludes: in this case, he must then admit that this
a firm,

passage will afford a *complete* answer to his challenge to Dr. Priestley, for the learned bishop says, p. 243, "Have you (Dr. Priestley) *evidence* that Christ was "NOT worshipped by the Ebionites?" Your Lordship's own words shall answer this challenge. "Your Lordship says, p. 181, 'he (Mr. Badcock) 'might have added another complaint; that in your 'translation you [Dr. Priestley] have suppressed another clause in the same period, in which certain 'persons are treated with great severity,' "who instead "of *worshipping* Jesus," ['instead of paying Him *divine worship*, for that is the *proper force* of the word 'Sebein'] "confessed Him *only in name*." As the learned bishop supposes that the *certain persons* here alluded to were Ebionites, and as he acknowledges that they did *not* worship Jesus, this passage is *direct* evidence that the Ebionites, if they were the persons here alluded to, as his Lordship supposes, did *not* worship Jesus. Moreover, it would also prove that Theodotus, who lived forty years after Justin, was not the *first* who broached this doctrine at Rome—that Jesus was NOT to be worshipped—as his Lordship has asserted. It is true, that his Lordship, following Dr. Priestley, calls these persons to whom Justin alludes,

alludes, Unitarians, and not Ebionites; but his Lordship, and the ingenious Doctor must excuse me, if I cannot avoid ascribing to ignorance, or rather to their not having accurate notions of the *early* heresies which divided the church, the using so very improper a term; which is the more surprising in his Lordship, as he quotes Mr. Badcock upon the place, *vide* Monthly Review, January 1784, who with propriety makes use of the term Ebionite: for his Lordship must know that there were no sect of Christians, save the Gnostics and the Arians, who did not *avow* themselves to be Unitarians; that is, worshippers of ONE God. And can that be a proper name which carries with it no proper distinction? The term Unitarian is modern, and utterly improper to be introduced, where accurate language is indispensably requisite. Nevertheless this term is used by these learned gentlemen, as descriptive of the Ebionite, Sabellian, and Humanist sects; and as if they were *one* and the *same* heresy³⁵.

The

35 I cannot here avoid noticing another passage from Justin Martyr, about which also the learned are divided with regard to its precise

The using this improper term hath caused great confusion

meaning ; but I own that its meaning appears so obvious to me, that I can only ascribe it to extreme prejudice, how any person, having any knowledge in the Greek language, could possibly have missed it. I shall first give the passage in the original, with the translations in the order of time, marking the material differences in Italics. Justin says,
 “ Και γαρ εἰσι τινες, ἀπο τῶ ημετέρῃ γενεῆς, ὁμολογούντες αὐτὸν Χριστὸν
 “ εἶναι, ἀνθρώπον δὲ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενομένον ἀποφαινομένοι· οἷς ἔ
 “ συνίθεμαι· ἔδ’ ἂν πλείοσι ταῦτα μοι δοξασάντες εἴποιεν, ἐπειδὴ
 “ ἔκ ἀνθρωπείνοις διδασμασι κεκελευσμεθα ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ τῷ Χρῆστῳ περὶ
 “ θεοῦθαι, ἀλλὰ τοῖς διὰ τῶν μακαρίων προφητῶν κηρυχθείσι, καὶ
 “ δι’ αὐτοῦ διδασχθείσι.” Edit. Thirlby, p. 234. Thus translated by

Doctor Priestley.

“ There are some of our *profession* who acknowledge Him (Jesus) to
 “ be the Christ, yet maintain that He was a man born of man. I do
 “ not agree with them, *nor should I be prevailed upon by ever so many who*
 “ *hold that opinion*; because we are taught by Christ Himself not to
 “ receive our doctrine from men, but from what was taught by the
 “ holy prophets, and by Himself.” Corruptions of Christianity, vol. i.
 p. 17.

Mr. Badcock.

“ There are some of our *profession* who acknowledge Him to be the
 “ Christ, and yet maintain that he was a man born in the natural way ;
 “ to whom I could not yield my assent, *no, not even if the majority of*
 “ *Christians should think the same*, because we are commanded by Christ
 “ Himself not to rely on human doctrines, but to receive those which
 “ were published by the blessed prophets, and which he Himself taught
 “ us.” Monthly Review, vol. 68. p. 522.

By Doctor Priestley’s Learned Vindicator.

“ There are some of our *race* (viz. Gentiles) who acknowledge Him
 “ to be the Christ, and yet maintain that he was a Man born in the
 “ natural

sion in Dr. Priestley's History of Opinions, and makes it
so

" natural way; to whom I do not assent, *though the majority may have*
" *told me that they had been of the same opinion,*" &c.

I should thus translate it.

" And there are some who confess Christ Himself to be of *our race*
" (that is, of the human race), maintaining Him to be Man born of
" man; with whom I do not agree; nor if the *majority* thus thinking,
" should tell these things to me: seeing that we are commanded by
" Christ Himself not to believe in human doctrines, but in those pub-
" lished by the blessed prophets, and taught by Himself."

The reader will perceive that word *genos* is rendered by Dr. Priestley and Mr. Badcock by the word *profession*; a very far-fetched meaning, indeed! and which I don't perceive in my Lexicon, which is Constantine's. Dr. P. also says, " Nor should I be prevailed upon by ever so many
" who hold that opinion;" to which Mr. B.'s majority of Christians
" may be deemed equivalent, and the Vindicators, majority:" for though Mr. B. had no authority from the original for his *Christians*, and though this is noticed by the Vindicator, yet he does not deny but that they are those who are understood. Now this is what I absolutely deny; for those Christians were very few who thought that Jesus was a mere man, and the Christ.—The *Tines*—or the some—or the few—of Justin refer to the followers of Paul of Samosate, and his pleistoi to the Ebionites and Double Ebionites, which accords with the truth of history.—It will be objected, how could Justin refer to doctrines not promulgated for near a century after his time? This no doubt should be no difficulty with the learned bishop, who believes that the primitive fathers wrote proleptically: but to those who will not be satisfied with *such* an answer, I affirm, that the works of Justin Martyr are *spurious*, and were composed about the middle of the third century, even *after* Origen wrote, for this father denies the *sufferings of the Deity* in Jesus; whereas Justin affirms it: it was, however, a doctrine unknown in the church, till about the time of the deposition of Sabellius. The Vindicator has no

so difficult to discover his own opinion, which I acknowledge I have not perceived in that work. Candidus, however (*V. Gent. Mag.* August, 1789, p. 706.),

authority for his *yet*, which materially affects the sense; moreover, it is Chrestou in Justin, not Christou.

Mr. Badcock, *Monthly Review*, vol. lxix. p. 315, n. thus translates a part of the same passage as if exactly and indisputably literal, and to shew the propriety of his former construction, *εις with whom, & συνιθεμαι I do not agree; &δ neither, αν if, πλειστοι the greater part, δοξασαντες who have thought (or professed), ταυτα the same things, μοι with me, ειποιεν should assert it*, viz. what the *Tines* had asserted—"that Christ was a man, born of man." This construction I can by no means subscribe to; for *ταυτα* certainly as a relative must refer to something which preceded, and does not mean, the *same* things, but *these* things, i. e. the opinions of the *Tines*; besides, *μοι* is translated in the ablative case instead of the dative, and made to depend on the participle: add to this the improbability of Justin's supposition, according to this interpretation, that orthodox Christians should assert heretical notions.

It may not be improper here to lay before the reader the *different modes* in which the disputed part of this passage is translated by Mr. Badcock. He thus renders it, *Monthly Review*, vol. lxix. p. 230, "For there are *some*, I acknowledge, of our profession, who confess that he was the Christ, but at the same time assert that he was a man born in the natural way—with whom I do not agree, neither could I, although the major part had *adopted* the *same* opinion." What opinion? Indisputably the opinion of the *some*.—Same volume, p. 314, he thus translates: "With whom I do not agree; neither—if the majority, who have been of the same persuasion with me, should say so." Here we find the major *part* of Justin's *own* opinion, whereas in the preceding passage they were of a *different* one. I wish to know what induced Mr. Badcock *so* materially to alter his mode of translating. I think it was his duty to have acquainted his readers of it.

will

will receive satisfaction on this head, from the following passages taken from the Doctor's other works.

" He [Hegippus], as an Unitarian, believed that
 " all the extraordinary power exerted by Christ, was
 " that of the Father *residing in Him.*" V. Reply to
 the Animadversions of the Monthly Review, June,
 1783. The Doctor again says, " What we [Soci-
 " nians] believe, and all that is required by our in-
 " terpretation of the *Logos* (as meaning the Divine
 " Attribute, *wisdom*) is, that a *portion* only of the
 " *same wisdom* that formed the universe was commu-
 " nicated to Christ; a *portion sufficient* to enable Him
 " to do what he actually did, and to say what he
 " actually said." Second Letter to Dr. now Bp.
 Horsley, p. 147. See also Letters to Dr. Geddes,
 p. 13. 27.—This is the doctrine which I have
 ascribed to the Sabellians; but as the learned and
 ingenious Doctor thinks that these were the doctrines
 held by Paul of Samosate and Photinus, I trust that
 the following passages will convince him of his error;
 for they did not think that *any portion at all* of the
 Logos, or Wisdom of God, was communicated to
 Jesus. Socrates, the historian, says, " that Nesto-
 " rius

“ rius was accused by many, as saying that the Lord
 “ was a *mere* man, and thus introducing into the
 “ church the sentiments of Paul of Samosate and
 “ Photinus³⁶.” Marius Mercator says, “ For Paul
 “ and Photinus are ignorant of the *Deity* of the
 “ Son³⁷.” Augustine, in his Sermon; “ For he
 “ [Manes] says, Christ is *only God, having nothing at*
 “ *all of man*. This the Manichæans affirm. The
 “ Photinians [that he was] *man only*. The Mani-
 “ cheans [that he was] *God only*. Those confess
 “ *nothing divine* in the Lord—these as if nothing
 “ *human*³⁸”. I could adduce many passages equally
 applicable from the same author; but shall only refer
 my reader to Lardner, vol. iv. p. 365.; former edit.
 vol. ix. p. 20. Vincentius Lirinensis says, “ There-

³⁶ Νεστοριος δε δοξαν παρα τοις πολλοις ειχεν, ως ψιλον ανθρωπον λεγων τον κυριον, κ' ως Παυλος τε Σαμωσαλειως κ' Φωτεινις δογμα εις την εκκλησιαν αγων. Lib. VII. cap. xxxii. p. 381.---Hist. Op. vol. iv, p. 241.

³⁷ Nam Paulus & Photinus nesciunt filii deitatem. Opera, p. 79. ---Hist. Op. vol. iv. p. 244.

³⁸ Ait enim, Christus Deus est tantum, omnino hominis nihil habens. Hoc Manichæi dicunt. Photiniani, homo tantum; Manichæi, Deus tantum. Illi nihil divinum in Domino confitentur; isti quasi totum Divinum. Serm. xxxvii. cap. 12.---Lard. vol. iii. p. 541, n. c.; form. edit. vol. vi. p. 414.

“ fore this is the heresy of Photinus. He says that
 “ God is single and solitary [or alone], and is to be
 “ confessed after the Jewish manner. He denies the
 “ fulness of the Trinity, nor thinks that there is
 “ any person of the word of God, or any of the Holy
 “ Spirit. But he affirms Christ to be only a *solitary*
 “ Man, who began his existence from Mary: and by
 “ every means teaches this—that we ought to wor-
 “ ship the single person of God the Father, and the
 “ single man Christ ³⁹.” Sulpitius Severus says, “ But
 “ Photinus hath advanced a *new* heresy, *differing*
 “ indeed *in the union* from that of Sabellius; but he
 “ affirmed that the beginning of Christ was from
 “ Mary ⁴⁰.” This passage *proves*, that Photinianism was
 a *distinct* heresy from Sabellianism: that Paul of

39 Photini ergo secta hæc est. Dicit deum singulum esse ac solita-
 rum, & more Judaico confitendum. Trinitatis plenitudinem negat,
 neque, ullam Dei verbi, aut ullam spiritus sancti putat esse personam.
 Christum vero hominem tantum modo solitarium adferit, cui princi-
 pium adscribit ex Maria. Et hoc omnimodo dogmatizat, solam nos per-
 sonam Dei Patris, & solum Christum hominem colere debemus. Vin.
 Lir. Commen. cap. xvii.—Lard. vol. iv. p. 365, n. h.; form. edit.
 vol. ix. p. 20.

40 Photinus vero novam hæresim jam ante protulerat a Sabellio qui-
 dem in unione dissentiens, sed initium Christi a Maria prædicabat.
 Sulpic. Sev. Hist. Sacr. lib. ii. cap. 37.—Lard. vol. iv. ibid.

Samosate thought, in the main, respecting Christ, as Photinus, the above passages prove. Besides, it is highly improbable, that a general council should be assembled to condemn Sabellius, and in a few years after, that another general council should be assembled to condemn Paul of Samosate for holding the same identical doctrines. I will affirm, that two general councils, and these are admitted to be such, were never assembled to condemn the same identical heresy. If it should be said, was not Photinus condemned and deposed by a council, for maintaining the same doctrines as Paul of Samosate? I can not admit that Photinus held *precisely* the *same* doctrines as Paul of Samosate: he himself declared, that all opinions except his *own* were wrong, which seems to be a direct denial of his agreeing in all points with Paul. I admit that Paul of Samosate and Photinus are connected together in some of the fathers by the conjunction copulative 'and,' even in Athanasius; but an exact *sameness* of opinions by no means from hence follows, but rather a general resemblance, and that on the point in question, the mere manhood of Jesus: for, that persons being connected together by the copulative conjunction

tion

tion naturally infers a difference in their sentiments, I could adduce the authority of Bishop Horsley, did such an obvious position require any support. But were it otherwise, I apprehend that such passages, in opposition to Photinus's decisive testimony, should not be regarded; especially seeing how easy it was to interpolate a name, a word or two, which I will venture to affirm is the case with respect to some of the passages already adduced: for, to complete the character of the fathers; it is universally admitted by all the learned, that they were interpolators; that is, falsifiers: in a word, to support their system, there was no sort of literary fraud of which they were not guilty. The tree is known by its fruit: "A good tree bringeth forth good fruit."

I have also asserted, that Paul of Samosate was the first propounder of the Humanist sentiment. In opposition to this I am aware, that it may be asserted what Eusebius relates of Artemas, or Artemon, and the two Theodotuses, as having propounded this notion above half a century before Paul. But I shall not scruple to affirm, that what Eusebius relates on this head is a lie; for were it true, it is scarcely possible that this

M

notion

notion would not have been noticed by Tertullian and Origen, who have so particularly taken notice of the Ebionites. Moreover, upon what authority does Eusebius relate what he says of these persons? The authority of an *anonymous* writer. Singular indeed! that the writer's name, who informs us of the sentiments of those persons, should be lost within a century; particularly, when he was the *single* evidence.—Again, whether this heretic's name was Artemas, or Artemon, could not be determined by the ancients. Is this probable, had such a person ever existed? As to the Two Theodotuses, I think their story is equally improbable: for they are declared *both* to have appeared at the *same* time in *Rome*, which was not their *native* country—to have propounded *both* the *same* identical doctrines—the only difference between them being, that one was a banker, and the other a tanner: however, no notice is taken of them for a century, except by this *anonymous* writer, cited by Eusebius. I will aver, that upon equal evidence (evidence however rejected by the learned and candid Muratori), many of the popish miracles, ought to be received; but it may be, that the Orthodox
of

of the church of England are not so nice, with regard to evidence, as this learned *Catholic*. I place in the same predicament what is said of Victor's excommunicating the eastern churches for not celebrating Easter upon the same day as the Christians of the western. The thing is in itself utterly improbable. According to the Orthodox themselves, their own situation at Rome was very precarious at the very time in which this thunderbolt is supposed to have been launched by its bishop, and that too without the call of a general council. But is it at all probable, that in *such* times, that the persecuted themselves would go a cutting one another's throats, or what was nearly tantamount, about trifles; to wit, whether Easter, after the Jewish manner, should be celebrated on the fourteenth day after the first full moon that happened in the first month of the Jewish year, or the Sunday after the fourteenth day. I have observed, that the Orthodox had two resources in every difficulty with those who differed from them in sentiment: the first was, declaring the opinion to be a novelty, and of course false; for it could not be supposed that any thing materially wrong would be permitted in those *assemblies* for

centuries, which when *two* or *three*, 'were gathered
 'together,' were directed by the Holy Spirit. This
 would be an absurdity. However, not solely rely-
 ing upon this argument, they in the *same* breath af-
 firmed, that it was an *an old confuted, reprobated notion*;
 and immediately there issued forth into light some
 anonymous writing, or some writing that never was
 heard of before, with a fictitious name to it, acquaint-
 ing the readers, that an opinion similar to that against
 which it was aimed, had been broached a century be-
 fore; and had been condemned and reprobated, not
 by general councils, but by the bishop of Rome, at a
 time when his opinion was thought *little* of in the
 church; and this alone should be sufficient to prevent
 any one from believing the account, except those inte-
 rested in the deceit. This I affirm to have been the
 case with regard to the bishop of Rome, for half a
 century or more after the time assigned to those ex-
 communications of Theodotus: for it is a known fact,
 that Saint Cyprian and Saint Firmilian (*V. n. 18 and 19,*
p. 39.) opposed the then bishop—or if the Catholics
 choose—pope of Rome—in the article of baptism,
 knowing nothing at all of his infallibility—yet this
 opposition

opposition has not prevented them from being canonized as SAINTS. Nevertheless, the *well-known* limitation of the bishop of Rome's power, does not prevent the Protestants from admitting the account, because agreeable to their own prejudices.



TO
The REV. Dr. KNOWLES,
PREBENDARY of ELY.

Reverend Sir,

HAPPENING to be some time ago at my book-feller's, his clerk handed to me your pamphlet upon *primitive Christianity*. I looked over the title-page and said, that, in the main, I perfectly agreed with you, desiring him at the same time to send it to me, thinking it might be useful in regard of a work upon the same subject, which I purpose shortly to lay before the public. I thought it surprized him when I said that I *in the main* agreed with you in sentiment, knowing that I attended Mr. Lindsey's chapel. The work alluded to, I trust, will satisfactorily clear up the enigma. Not having immediate occasion to examine the pamphlet, it lay uncut for a few days, when accidentally opening it, my eye was attracted to a note, p. 49, in which it instantly perceived the name of Lardner. I read the passage, which seemed to convey a censure, as if his work, *on the credibility of the Gospel history*, permit me to call it his immortal work, had been
B garbled ;

garbled ; that is, that he concealed aught of that which he should not, lest it might militate against his favourite opinions : the passage runs thus, “ Dr. Lardner has “ made a copious collection of the several quotations and “ allusions which he found in the primitive Fathers, in “ support of the credibility of the Gospel-history ; but “ it is remarkable that he has *scarcely* produced a passage that might confirm the Scripture-doctrine of the “ divinity of Jesus Christ.” Whether your criticism be just in its full extent I know not, having never read the Fathers ; but that your own pamphlet will not support your assertion, or insinuation, will be evident by comparing your own quotations with those transcribed by him. Among other passages quoted by Lardner from the Epistle of Barnabas, please to consider the following.

No. 18, ch. 14. Barnabas having observed that
 ‘ Moses received from God the two tables of the com-
 ‘ mandments written by the finger of God, but the people
 ‘ being fallen to idolatry, he cast them to the ground,
 ‘ and the tables of the covenant were broken, goes on’—
 “ Moses, being a servant, received them, [or it, meaning
 “ the covenant, or testament ;] but *the Lord himself* has
 “ given them to us. the people of his inheritance, he having suffered for us ;” ‘ alluding to Heb. iii. 5.’ Again.

No. 14, ch. 16, “ Having received the remission

“ of



“ of our sins, and trusting in the name of the *Lord*
 “ we are made new, again created fresh; therefore *God*
 “ *truly* dwells in our house; that is, in us.—This is the
 “ spiritual temple built unto the Lord. Again,

No. 11, ch. 12. ‘ Barnabas, having spoken of the
 ‘ directions given by Moses to the Israelites in the wil-
 ‘ derness, to look to the brazen serpent, says, “ You
 “ have in this also the glory of Jesus for as much as in
 “ *him are all things*, and to him.”

No. 9, ch. 7. “ If, therefore, the Son of God, who
 “ is the *Lord of all*, and shall judge the quick and the dead,
 “ hath suffered”—These three passages I apprehend as
 strongly imply *divinity* as the one adduced by yourself.
 But let the reader judge: you say, page 49, “ Behold!
 “ again, Jesus, not the Son of man, but of God, made
 “ manifest in the flesh.” Here Jesus is called the Son of
 God; but, in No. 9, he is moreover called the *Lord of*
all. In No. 11, *Infiniteness* is ascribed to him. In No.
 18, he is called the *Lord himself*, which is at least
 tantamount to the *Son of God*. But, lest you should
 think differently, I beg leave to know from you,
 whether you think, that when the high-priest upon
 his trial, Matth. xxvi. 63. asked Jesus whether he was
 the *Son of God*; and in like manner the people, Luke
 xxii. 70. that they thought they were asking him, whether

he was the *Lord himself*, or something greater, if *Son of God* implies something greater than the *Lord himself*? I also ask you can you for a moment suppose, that, by this question, the high-priest and people could intend more than demanding whether he was a Prophet or the Messiah? I ask, is it possible, that fanaticism and folly could have arrived to such a height, as for a chief magistrate and an entire body of people to ask a person, whom they thought to be entirely in their power, whom they were buffeting, &c. in the most opprobrious manner, whether he was the *great God of Heaven*? I trust hereafter that whoever asserts, that *Son of God* intends more than a *Prophet*, a *Man* commissioned by the Deity for a particular purpose, will take the consequences with it. That *Son of God*, in the mouth of Jews, intended precisely a Prophet, is also evident from their demanding of him, while striking him, to *prophesy* who struck him. To save the reader the trouble of referring to the New Testament, I shall here transcribe the account of the transaction as we find it in the gospel of Mathew, ch. xxvi. 63, &c.

“ But Jesus held his peace. And the high-priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus said unto him, Thou hast said :
 “ never

“ nevertheless I say unto you, *hereafter* you shall see the
 “ Son of Man sitting upon the right hand of power, and
 “ coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high-priest
 “ rent his clothes, saying, he hath spoken blasphemy ;
 “ what farther need have we of witnesses ? Behold, now
 “ ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye ? They
 “ answered, and said, he is guilty of death. Then did they
 “ spit in his face, and buffeted him, and others smote him
 “ with the palms of their hands, saying, *prophecy* unto us,
 “ thou Christ, who is he that smote thee ?” What was his
 blasphemy ? indisputably his saying, “ *hereafter* you shall
 “ see the Son of man sitting upon the right hand of power,
 “ and coming in the clouds of heaven :” that is, his having
 had the presumption (for such it must have appeared to the
 High-Priest) to *prophecy*. For that he said something wor-
 thy of death, in the opinion of the Jews, is evident from
 John xix. 7. “ The Jews answered him, [Pilate,] we
 “ have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he
 “ made himself the *Son of God* ;” which law will be found
 in Deuteronomy xviii. 20, &c. — “ But the Prophet
 “ which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which
 “ I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak
 “ in the name of other Gods, even that Prophet shall die.
 “ And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the
 “ word

“ word which the Lord hath not spoken? when a Prophet
 “ speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not,
 “ nor come to pass, that *is* the thing which the Lord hath
 “ not spoken, *but* the Prophet hath spoken it presumptu-
 “ ously : thou shalt not be afraid of him.” But if *Son of*
God implies any thing more than *Prophet*, I should be
 glad to be informed in what book of the Old Testament
 we shall find *the law* for punishing this assertion. This
 passage, in connection with the 13th ch. of Deut. also
 shews that miracles are no *test* of a *divine mission*.

I shall now lay before the reader an observation, which
 I believe to be peculiar to myself, respecting the origin,
 or the reason, why the followers of Jesus were called
 Christians. It appears from the above-cited passage, that
 Jesus, upon his trial, was called *Christ*, a term equi-
 valent, according to Christians, to Messiah, or the A-
 nointed ; but how very improbable is it that he should
 be thus *honourably* distinguished by those persons who
 held him in abhorrence? Has there ever been an in-
 stance of a *nick-name*, a name *imposed* by enemies, *implying*
honour? and that this name implies honour is evident from
 its being derived from a Greek term signifying *to anoint*,
 as if Jesus was anointed by the Holy Ghost : add to this,
 that the Jews *knew nothing of the Holy Ghost*, therefore
 they

they could not give him this name upon this account.*

Should we not therefore seek some other origin for the
name?

* That the term *Christ* could not have been made use of by the High-Priest and Jews, at the time of his trial, is still more evident from the Jews being forty years after ignorant of the Greek tongue, and therefore their using a nickname, derived from a language which they did not understand, besides the improbability, rather impossibility, would be absurd, as the *Christ* could not have been perceived by their countrymen; and this will hold more strongly with regard to the Roman language, from which some derive the word *Christus*; for no one pretends, that the Jews were at all acquainted with the Roman tongue. Besides, if derived from the Roman tongue, what does it signify? for that *all* nicknames are significative will be denied, I apprehend, by no one. As I believe it is *supposed* in general by the learned that the Greek language was not totally unknown among the Jews, the following passages from Josephus will shew the contrary. ‘Now Simon and John, and they that were with them, desire a conference with Titus, which he granted. He placed himself on the western side of the inner court of the temple, and there was a bridge that parted them. There were great numbers of Jews waiting with those two tyrants, and there were also many Romans on the side of Titus. He ordered the soldiers to refrain their rage, and appointed an *interpreter*.’ What occasion was there for an interpreter, if the leaders of the Jews were acquainted with the Greek language, of which Titus cannot be supposed to have been ignorant; it being a necessary part of the education of the Roman youth of any distinction? Josephus again says, ‘What happened in the Roman camp I saw, and wrote it down carefully; what information the deserters brought out of the city, I was the only man that understood it;’ which I apprehend is tantamount to saying, that he was the only person in the Roman camp who could speak the Greek

name? Being given by enemies, a *dishonourable* origin should be sought, this being agreeable to human nature. May I not therefore suppose that this term has its root from the Greek word *kraō*, which signifies to *prophecy*, and that the words now almost universally found written *Christos*, were originally written *Chrēstos* or *Chrēstōr*; i. e. Prophecier, to which the Romans gave their own termination, writing *Christus*; and *Christiani*, *Chrēstiani*; i. e. followers of the Prophecier; and that therefore the meaning of the 68th ver. xxvi ch. of Matt. which runs thus, “ saying, Prophecy “ unto us, thou Christ, who is he that smote thee?” is equivalent to saying, Prophecy unto us, thou prophecier, who is, &c. And that this manner of writing *Christos* was *well known* to the ancients appears from Lard. VI. 266. former ed. of heathen Testimonies vol. I. 364, who says, “ but it is well known that our Saviour was sometimes called *Chrestus* by heathen people.” It is thus written in Suetonius and in the *Philopatris*, a work *erroneously* ascribed to Lucian, being, in the opinion of Moyle and Lardner, a work of the fourth century. And that this was a *reproachful* term is evident from the pains that Tertullian and Lactantius have taken to set the heathens right upon this head,

and the language spoken by the Jews. V. Jos. L. 6. c. 6. §. 2. Lard. 7. 9. 3. former Ed. 1. 113. Also Jos. de B. Jud. in Pr. Sect. 1. Lard. 7. 105. former Ed. 1. 129.

head, who by this name distinguished the followers of Jesus. Their words, which will be found in the margin of the page just cited from Lardner, are “Perperam Chrestianus pronuntiatur a vobis,” &c. Tert. Ap. c. 3. “Sed exponenda hujus nominis ratio est, propter ignorantium errorem, qui cum immutata litera Chrestum solent dicere.” Lactantius, Divin. Just. l. 4. c. 7. If this origin for the name be admitted, it will afford the strongest evidence of Jesus having prophesied that remains on record; for, it is the testimony of *heathen enemies* and *unbelievers*; and, as no effect is without a proportionate cause, they would never have called him a *prophesier* if he had not *prophesied*, or made pretensions to it. Now we know of no prophecies attributed to Jesus, save those mentioned in the gospels. That he did say every thing ascribed to him in them I by no means credit; being convinced that every book of the New Testament is spurious;* that is, that the books of the New Testament were composed by other persons than those whose names they bear; and that, except the person who wrote Mark’s gospel, the writers of the other Gospels appear, by their ignorance of the lo-

C

cal

* Let not the timid reader be alarmed at this assertion. Spurious works have ever been grounded upon real undeniable facts; and therefore may be esteemed a conclusive argument as to the reality of the principal fact upon which they are moulded.

cal customs and manners of the Jews, not to have been Jews themselves, and therefore unworthy of credit, except inasmuch as they are supported by Mark's gospel : besides, that Mark's gospel is even very considerably interpolated we have the testimony of Jerom. To attempt to prove the spurioufness of these books—To discover the true gospel of Mark—To prove the divine mission of Jesus — And the spurioufness of those writings ascribed to the Fathers for the first and second centuries, and this almost without exception, will be the object of the work alluded to now in the press. Besides, I do not think that there is sufficient reason to induce us to conclude that the Jews in their appointed (our Christ) expected any thing more than a prince, or a line of princes, or temporal governors, under whom they were to enjoy that happiness foretold by their prophets. But to return from this digression.

Is it not almost the uniform assertion of the ancients that John wrote his gospel after the other evangelists? and that because the three first evangelists treated only of the humanity of Jesus ; whereas it was allotted to be his part, as being the most excellent of the apostles, to treat of what respected his divinity. I ask you then, could the writers who assert this ; to wit, Clement of Alexandria, Theodore, Jerome, Cosmas, (vide Lardner's Testimonies,) make such an
 assertion,

assertion, or assign such a reason, for John's writing his gospel, if the phrase Son of God *necessarily* inferred divinity? for, if so, the three first evangelists, having applied this term to Jesus, of course affirmed his divinity.

The passage you adduce, page 50, from the first epistle of Clemens Romanus, Lardner has also transcribed; therefore I presume, that, as you were upon the search for the *strongest* passage in proof of Clemens's belief in the *divinity* of Jesus, that a *stronger* one could not be found; and, as you will find the same passage in Lardner, No. 22, I trust that you will acquit him with respect to this primitive Father. But, if you examine the second vol. of Lardner, last edition, p. 23, (former edition, p. 49,) you will find these words. ' Photius commends the epistle in the main. But still he says, " There are several " things in it liable to censure. One is, that the writer, " though he calls our Lord High-Priest and Patron, gives " him none of the higher and more *divine* titles. However, " he does not any where openly blaspheme him." ' That is, ' in modern language, it is a Socinian epistle. So, upon ' many occasions, Photius is apt to censure antient writers, who come not up to the orthodoxy of his time.' So, Sir, it seems that the *orthodox* Photius was of opinion, that divinity was not to be found in this primitive Father; and, should any one be surprised that the *Socinian* Lard-

ner, filled with *prejudices* in favour of his *heretical* sentiments, should not have discovered it. But it may be that you imagine, from your adducing the passage which you have adduced, that it necessarily infers Deity, and therefore that Photius erred in his judgement, and that Lardner was not justified in calling it a Socinian epistle. However, let the reader judge. Your words are, p. 50, “ Our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the *sceptre* of the majesty of God, came “ not in the shew of pride and arrogance, as he might have “ done, but in humility, as the Holy Ghost had before spoken concerning him.” I presume you will not dispute that the *sceptre* never yet was supposed to be *equal* to the holder of it, therefore your producing this passage militates against modern orthodoxy, which teaches us, that the Son is *equal* to the Father. I shall make no observation upon the passage adduced from the 2d epistle of Clement, as Lardner says, that it plainly is not his; and you yourself seem to imply something similar, by saying that the *first* epistle was never disputed, plainly inferring that the second was.

P. 53, you say, “ Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with ‘ Trypho the Jew, properly applies his own scripture to ‘ convince him that Christ is to be worshipped as in Ps. ‘ xlv. or xlv. ver. 12. as it stands in our translation, *He*
‘ is

‘ *is thy Lord God, worship him* ; wherein the Psalmist pro-
 ‘ phetically points out the majesty of Christ’s kingdom and
 ‘ the duty of his church ; proving thence that both God
 ‘ and Christ are to be worshipped : and then he asks Try-
 ‘ pho, ‘ Whether he knew any other mentioned in Scrip-
 ‘ ture to be adored as Lord and God besides the Maker of
 ‘ this world and Christ? ’ wherein he shews that both one
 ‘ and the other is such. The same he proves from other
 ‘ Scriptures, but yet he teaches, in his Apology, that none
 ‘ but the *true* God is to be worshipped. The consequence
 ‘ is plain, as has been already observed, that he believed
 ‘ Christ to be the *true God*, and that as such he ought to
 ‘ be adored.” Your comment and conclusion I shall not
 dispute, though methinks it would be still clearer were
 these passages all taken from the *same* tract. However,
 it lay not within Lardner’s plan to notice this passage.
 His object was to find allusions or citations to the writings
 of the *New Testament*, and not to the *Psalms* ; therefore
 I hope you will acquit him upon this count.

P. 54, you cite a passage* from Athenagoras, but Lard-
 ner cites the same, V. No. 5 ; therefore I presume that
 there was not a passage in this writer more expressive of
 Christ’s *divinity*, otherwise *you* should have instanced it.

P.

* “ The Father and the Son being one, and the Son being in the Father,
 “ and the Father in the Son.”

P. 54, you cite two passages* from Theophilus, bishop of Antioch ; one of which you will find *more fully* in Lardner, in No. 5 ; the other you will find in No. 21.

Again, p. 54, you cite two passages from Irenæus ; Lardner cites one of them,† that which alludes to Paul's Epistle to the Romans ; with regard to the other, which alludes to the Psalms, as I have already observed, it did not lie within his plan.

P. 56. 'Tertullian,' you say, "likewise justifies our translation of St. Paul, Philip ii. 6. for, these are his words,

* "These things, says he, the holy Scriptures teach us, and all who are moved by the Holy Spirit, among whom John says, *In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God* ; shewing, that, after the first, God was alone, and in him was the word. Then he says, *and the word was God, &c.*" And again, "For, before that any thing was made, he had him for his counsellor, being his understanding and wisdom. But, when he determined to make these things about which he had taken counsel, he brought forth from himself this word, *the first-born of every creature.*"

† "Whose are the Fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen." 'By which, you say, he plainly acknowledges no other reading or construction besides the recited one, which is followed by Tertullian, and others in the subsequent ages.' However, I am obliged to you for informing me that Humanism, or that Christ was only a *mere man*, was a notion not totally unknown in the time of Paul. You say, 'For, in order to prove, against the heretics of that time, that they could not think the Emmanuel to be a *man only*, he introduces this passage of Paul's concerning Israel ; *Whose are the Fathers, &c.*'

words, ‘ *Sermo enim Deus, qui in effigie Dei constitutus*
‘ *existimavit parari Deo*: thought it not robbery to be
‘ equal with God. And again, in his book against *Prax-*
‘ *eas*, ch. 7. and 22. saying, *I and my Father are one*, he
‘ shews that there were two, whom he joins together as
‘ equals, (*quos æquat et jungit.*)— But above all, Ter-
‘ tullian alludes, in the same book against *Praxeas*, ch. 25.
‘ to St. John’s famous text, 1 John v. 7. *Connexus patris*
‘ *in filio, et filii in paracleto tres efficit cohærentes alte-*
‘ *rum ex altero, qui tres unum sunt, non unus*; answering
‘ exactly to the *τὸ ἓν* in the original; not one Person, but
‘ one Being. He adds, *Quomodo dictum est, Ego et Pater*
‘ *unum sumus, ad substantiæ unitatem non ad numeri sin-*
‘ *gularitatem.*’ This last passage is thus noticed by
Lardner, vol. II. p. 276, for. Ed. p. 619. ‘ It is supposed
‘ by some learned men that Tertullian has alluded to the
‘ disputed text which we have in 1 John, ver. 6, 7. I have
‘ put his words in the margin:’ “ *Cæterum, de meo su-*
“ *met, inquit, sicut ipse de Patris. Ita connexus Patris in*
“ *Filio, et Filii in Paracleto, tres efficit cohærentes, alte-*
“ *rum ex altero. Qui tres unum sunt, non unus. Quo-*
“ *modo dictum est, Ego et Pater unum sumus: ad substan-*
“ *tiæ unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem.*” The at-
tentive reader will perceive some differences between you
in the punctuation. Methinks that the omitting the *ita*,
and

and the preceding part of the paragraph *materially favours* your own side of the argument, making Tertullian speak *positively*; whereas he speaks by *similitude*. The other passage I do not see in Lardner. But you must well know that his object was to collect testimonies only to authenticate *each* book of the New Testament; and, when he got *one* sufficiently clear, that nothing more should fairly be required. Had he not introduced a passage, which alludes to the Ep. to the Philippians, in that case your censure would hold good. But might not Lardner have another reason? You know that he was a lover of the Scriptures of the New Testament, and how much he exerted himself to prove them the genuine and authentic writings of the persons whose names they bear; and might he not think that the passage you introduce was a sort of contradiction to the one he introduces in allusion to Rom. ix. 5. “I will therefore by no means say
 “Gods and Lords; but I will follow the Apostle, so that
 “if the Father and the Son are to be mentioned *together*,
 “I will say *God* the Father, and Jesus Christ the *Lord*. But,
 “when I mention Christ *only*, I can call him *God*, as the
 “Apostle does;” “*Of whom Christ came, who is, says he, over all, God blessed for ever.*” In the first passage, cited by you, p. 13, Christ is made equal to God; but by this passage

face it appears, that, when the Father and Jesus are mentioned together, that his proper appellation, according to Tertullian, is *Lord*, and *not* God. These *seeming* contradictions must amuse scoffers, and, I think, had better not needlessly to have been laid before them. I shall make no observation on your quotation from the testament of the twelve Patriarchs, that being a *spurious* work.

I trust now, Sir, that you will agree with me that your censure upon Lardner's works, if you intended to convey one, is totally done away; and, as your production strikes me to be the result of conviction, and to come from a person tempered by years, and therefore duly sensible of the duty (that cardinal duty of doing to others as we would be done by) either of unsaying what cannot be supported consistently with strict truth, which to the truly virtuous and religious must be a source of great satisfaction, when warmth or inattention betrays them into expressions which affect the moral character, but, above all the moral character of the dead, and I may add, too, the blameless character of the amiable and learned Dr. Lardner, or that you will clearly shew its justness.

Having now finished what I had at first proposed, I shall take a slight survey of your pamphlet.

D

You

You say, 1st page, ' The several writers of the ages
 ' next succeeding that of the Apostles, who are commonly
 ' called the Apostolical Fathers, must be allowed to
 ' be competent witnesses of what was taught and done
 ' by the Apostles themselves ; as these likewise must be
 ' allowed to have understood the meaning of their Master
 ' in the directions he gave them concerning the discipline
 ' and government of his church. If they had not un-
 ' derstood him aright, he would certainly have corrected
 ' their mistaken notions, in this respect, after his resur-
 ' rection, as he did their misconceptions of the nature of
 ' his kingdom before his death. If this degree of credit
 ' be denied to the authority of the Apostles, or their im-
 ' mediate successors, the primitive Fathers, which is given
 ' to writers of every other denomination, we must lay
 ' no stress upon the testimony of either. Such a sove-
 ' reign contempt for the decision of the latter will, it is
 ' to be feared, tend to diminish the reverence which is
 ' due to the relations of the former ; and, though it is
 ' not required that the authority of both should be held
 ' equally sacred, yet the oppugners of a religious esta-
 ' blishment, founded upon their concurrent evidence,
 ' carefully transmitted from one age to another, must be
 ' aware, that, what *true* religion would lose by discard-
 ' ing both, can be of no advantage to the false ; inasmuch

' as

' as they deprive themselves of the same sources from
 ' whence they endeavour to derive the corruption of
 ' Christianity, as they do us, who prove its genuineness
 ' from thence. Our deductions, indeed, are diametri-
 ' cally opposite; but when it is found that the practice
 ' of the church, which is matter of fact, corresponds
 ' with the doctrine which, as a church, we maintain;
 ' and that both join to support each other, we cannot,
 ' by any fair reasoning, be supposed to have misunder-
 ' stood or misinterpreted either.'

The force of this paragraph I apprehend is entirely enervated, by observing, that the *same authority* here adduced, that of the Apostles and their immediate successors even in continuation for at least *four* centuries, assures us that, in their own life-time, and for *four* centuries after not only that the *Apostles themselves* were opposed, but also their *orthodox* successors; their opponents affirming, some, as the Gnostics and the Docetæ, that the orthodox taught what was unworthy of Christ; others, as the E-bionites, that Jesus was but a mere man. Now we know from history that these two sects continued for four centuries, in very considerable numbers, in those countries in which Christianity was received, and that the Orthodox did not make any considerable number of proselytes, from either of

them, till after the time of Constantine; who, embracing orthodoxy, persecuted the Gnostics and Sabellians, together with the Arians and Heathens; and, when the Arians had possession of the Imperial throne, it is well known that they were equally implacable against those who differed from them, but particularly against the Humanists, during which persecutions the orthodox Christians, or reigning sect, scrupled not to betray and discover their heretical brethren to government, — a thing unknown during the heathen persecutions. This persecution, by the Orthodox or Arians, was carried on with such implacability, and so systematically, that, independently of personal sufferings, not a single production, prior to the Council of Nice,, of the Ebionites, or of the Sabellians, or of the Humanists, has descended to us, though many of them were allowed, even by their adversaries, to have been men of shining abilities, which they displayed in their heretical writings; nor have the Gnostic writings fared a whit better. So that orthodoxy may justly be said, like Mahometanism, to have been more indebted to the sword, or violence, for its propagation, than to argument. For, it is evident, even from the writings of the Fathers themselves, that the bulk of the people continued heathens till the time of Theodosius. Now, seeing that there were four sects who admitted the divine mission of Jesus, namely,—The
Ebionites,

Ebionites, who thought Jesus to be a divine Messenger, though not the Christ or Messiah ;—The Gnostics, who thought Christ to be totally deity ;—The Humanists who held Jesus to be the Christ, though a man, without any deity ;—and the Orthodox, who esteemed him to be both man and God in union ;—and, as each of the three last sects alleged apparently equal authorities for their very dissimilar sentiments, and as the contention was at last only determined by force and authority, which never produce conviction, I ask which of these sects should we now, agreeably to reason and common sense, most confide in. To enable the reader to form a proper judgement, I shall here mark the characters of these different sects ; and, as there is no dispute about what I am going to observe upon this head, that I know of, the reader may with more confidence form a judgement, if he should happen to be unversed in subjects of this nature. First, the Gnostics are admitted by all to have been deeply conversant in the learning and the philosophy of the times ; hence they acquired the name of Gnostics *from the Orthodox*, as persons who would *know*, or have *reasons*, for every thing ;* for, the meaning of the term in Greek is *knowers* ; and the ignorant and illiterate, especially when enthusiasts and fanatical, are ever prone to hold such in contempt, and to invent a
nick-

* See preliminary Disquisitions.

nick-name to denote it. In like manner, how is the studious and speculative farmer, the mechanic, or merchant, treated by the ignorant in the same line? Is it not by a nick-name indicative of a contempt for learning? This to me appears a far more probable reason for the name than that usually assigned; to wit, that the Gnostics *assumed* it to denote their superiority over ignorant orthodox Christians. True learning (and that the Gnostics were really learned and close reasoners abundantly appears from Lardner's Hist. of Heretics;) true learning, I say, and modesty being ever united, it would be contradicting human experience were they, in this instance, separated. Paul of Samosate, and Photinus, Humanists, were probably the most learned Christians of their times. On the other hand, the Ebionites are said to have been plain men. The Jewish followers of Jesus, his own countrymen, were *all* Ebionites; the learned Symmachus was a Jew and an Ebionite.—The Orthodox can only be known from their writings, which were so greatly admired, by themselves, that they used to read them in time of service for the edification of their flocks, and were deemed, by them, to be productions almost above human. Nay, our sacred canon was upon the point of receiving some of them. But the taste of the present times is much altered in this respect; for they, who have read the writings of the primitive

mitive Fathers, think them monuments of the lowest abjectness of the human understanding. They cannot refrain from smiling upon the recollection of the childish stories recited in them. I now ask the reader, which of these three sects was the most likely to tell the truth, and nothing but the truth. The weakness and credulity of the last, independently of their being in general notorious liars,* utterly disqualify them from being at all attended to. The learned (the Gnostics and Humanists) are generally speculators, therefore, adapting their future to their former acquirements, they should be attended to with caution. The Ebionites, being plain men, were most likely to tell the truth, without adding or diminishing : besides their being the countrymen of Jesus, they possessed far superior opportunities of knowing the truth than the Gentile converts, who could only come to the knowledge of it through others.

Page 5, &c. What you say, in respect of baptism, I think, militates against yourself. We have no writing of the *first* century in which it is said, that Baptism was performed *in* the name of the *Father*, and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost* ; and no writings of the *third* and *fourth* centuries (such being those of Basil, Ambrose, Didymus, and Cyprian which you cite, and improperly too, your Tract being divided into centuries, therefore

* V. Bishop Horsley's Tracts, p. 355, for a character of the Fathers.

therefore the writings of different centuries should not have been intermixed,) are admissible to prove (I might say in express contradiction to the writings of the *first* century, for in these I only find Baptism *in* the name of Jesus, or *into* Christ, or *into* Jesus; vide Acts ii. 38. viii. 16. Rom. vi. 3. unless, indeed, that 1 Cor. 12, 13. “ For, *by the Spirit* are we all baptized into one “ body,” be thought an exception, and equivalent to the Trinitarian mode) practices in the *first* century. But I shall go farther, and assert, that as the Apostles did *not* act agreeably to their Master’s command with respect to baptism, that no such order was given; for, to suppose them to have neglected his orders or directions, or to be heedless with regard to them, is a supposition too unnatural, and which no Catholic dare assert. I will also add here, *en passant*, that this command, so particularly recorded in Mathew’s gospel, and not hinted at in any of the other gospels, induces me to think, independently of many other reasons, that this gospel was the *last*-written of the gospels; for, as to the *traditional* testimony of the Fathers respecting the time, order, &c. of the gospels, I hold it in utter contempt, there being scarcely two of them who agree in what they say respecting them, as will most evidently appear from the Disquisition prefixed to my Harmony of the Gospels, now in the press.

Page 11. You say, ‘ The author of the Apostolical
 ‘ Constitutions, (whether it was Clemens, or any other,
 ‘ *it matters not*, for they are filled with useful informa-
 ‘ tion concerning the discipline of the church at this
 ‘ time,) has given us,’ &c. Am I in the 18th century?
 Is this a passage out of one of the primitive Fathers?
 No, truly. It belongs to the Rev. Dr. Knowles, Pre-
 bendary of Ely, in the year 1789. Is it possible that a
 reverend divine, in the 18th century, will assert, *it*
matters not whether a book be *apochryphal* or not, whe-
 ther a book bears a *lying* title or not? Many absurdities
 I have heard ascribed to the primitive Fathers, but never
 a greater one than this. Such conduct, *openly avowed*,
 would have been reprobated by them; which the fol-
 lowing incident, mentioned by Lardner, [vol. 5. p. 56. form.
 Ed. vol. 10. p. 136.] will prove. Lardner says, that
 ‘ when Salvian, of Marseilles, in the fifth century,
 ‘ published his books against covetousness, without his *own*
 ‘ name, and with an epistolary address, “ To the catholic
 ‘ church spread all over the world,” in the name of Ti-
 ‘ mothy,’ Salonius, a Gallican bishop, soon wrote to
 him about it, and told him, that, “ unless he clearly
 ‘ shewed the reason of that title, those books ought to
 ‘ be reckoned apocryphal.” These books of Salvian,

E

‘ bore

‘ bore the name of an apostolical man, and therefore
 ‘ appeared to make a claim to be esteemed canonical;
 ‘ but, since they were not written by such an one, they
 ‘ ought to be reckoned apocryphal; and though it is
 ‘ said that many of these books, which were called apo-
 ‘ cryphal, were written by heretics, yet it can make but
 ‘ little difference whether they are written by heretics or
 ‘ catholics, if they carry the name and title of *apostoli-*
 ‘ *cal* men, and are not really theirs.’

You say, page 12, ‘ In the form of prayer for conse-
 ‘ crating the water in baptism, &c.’ For which practice
 you quote the same apostolical Constitutions, as being, I
 presume, an apostolical injunction, or something nearly
 tantamount. I beg leave therefore to be informed, whe-
 ther the church of England continues this goodly prac-
 tice. As I apprehend it does not, I think you ought to
 apply to your ordinary to have so necessary an ordinance
 re-established. An act of parliament, I apprehend, will
 be indispensable; but that is a trifle in such a necessary work.
 I own I have a curiosity to see how the people would re-
 ceive the intelligence of *holy water* being once more intro-
 duced into the kingdom.

Page 18. You cite the Revelations. Suppose I say
 that all inferences from this book prove nothing, be-
 cause

cause the work is spurious, what reply can you make? Now, Sir, I do assert it, and that it was deemed *apochryphal* and *spurious*, and *contradicted*, by several of the ancients. However, at present, I shall only cite the following. Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, 'styled,' as you observe, p. 62, 'by the ancients, Dionysius the Great, upon account of his consummate wisdom and prudence, the most amiable disposition for moderation and candour, together with a profound learning in all sciences.' Now, when such a person, as you represent, wrote *expressly* to prove that the Revelations were *not* written by John the Evangelist, methinks it should shake the credit of that book very much. It is impossible for any scholar not to have known this fact, and to have concealed this from, or rather not to have acquainted, your reader, that there were doubts about its authenticity, I apprehend should not have been expected from a candid critic; a critic, who, as far as I am capable of judging of language, has censured Lardner for *management* upon a similar case; but for which I trust that I have shewn he was unjustly censured. A critic, who censures, ought surely to be secure himself from a like censure; but wherefore all this? Have you not already asserted, that *it matters not* whether a book be *apochryphal* or not? I

A.D.
274.

shall not blot out what I have written, but acknowledge I have censured where, agreeably to your principles, I had no right. Having said, that the book of Revelations is spurious, &c. my next authority for this assertion will be Eusebius, the learned bishop of Cæsarea. The passage you will find in Lardner's works, last Ed. Vol. IV. p. 227, form. Ed. vol. 8. p. 95.

‘ But,’ says Eusebius, ‘ it will be proper here to enumerate, in a summary way, the books of the New Testament which have been already mentioned. And, in the *first* place, are to be ranked the sacred four gospels; then the Acts of the Apostles: after that are to be reckoned the Epistles of Paul: in the *next* [place] that called the first Epistle of John, and the Epistle of Peter, are to be esteemed authentic. After these is to be placed, if it be thought fit, the *Revelation of John*, about which we shall observe the different opinions at a proper season. Of the controverted, but yet well-known or approved by the many, (*tois πολλοις*,) are that called the Epistle of James and that of Jude, and the 2d of Peter, and the 2d and 3d of John, whether they were written by the Evangelist or by *another* of the same name. Among the *spurious* are to be placed the acts of Paul, and the book intitled the Shepherd, and the Revelation of Peter; and besides these, that called the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and

‘ the

‘ the book called the Doctrines of the Apostles: and
 ‘ moreover, as I said, the *Revelation of John*, if it seem
 ‘ meet; which some, as I have said, rejected; others
 ‘ reckon among the books *universally** received. Among
 ‘ these also, some have reckoned the gospel according to
 ‘ the Hebrews, which the Hebrews, who have embraced
 ‘ Christ, make use of. All these may be reckoned con-
 ‘ troverted. It was however needful that I should put
 ‘ down a catalogue of these also, distinguishing the scrip-
 ‘ tures which, according to the ecclesiastical tradition,
 ‘ are true, genuine, and UNIVERSALLY acknow-
 ‘ ledged, from those *others that ARE NOT in the Testa-*
 ‘ *ment*, but are controverted, and yet appear to have been
 ‘ known to many.’ I hence infer, that, in the time of
 Eusebius, those only were admitted into the Testament
 which, according to ecclesiastical tradition, were true,
 genuine, and *universally* acknowledged, and these only
 are those mentioned in the first place; to wit, the four
 gospels, and the acts of the apostles and 13 epistles of
 Paul. The reader, unversed in these subjects, may
 possibly give me little thanks, if he is timorous, for pro-
 ducing a passage which shews to him that many books,
 in my opinion nine, [for Eusebius, in another place,
 observes that Paul’s Epistle to the Heb. was by *some* reject-
 ed,

* What frontless liars!

ed, as contradicted by the church of the Romans, as not being Paul's,] which are now included in our canon, were *not* so in the time of Eusebius: however, though clearly satisfied myself as to the number, let the reader judge for himself. — Cosmas, of Alexandria, says, [Lardner 5. 267, former Edition, 11, 269,] ‘ I forbear to allege arguments from the *catholic* epistles; because, from ancient time, the church has looked upon *them* as of *doubtful* authority; and, of all who have written commentaries upon the divine scriptures, not one has taken notice of the catholic epistles; and all, who have given an account of the canonical books of divine scripture, have spoken of them as *doubtful*; particularly *Irenæus*, Bishop of Lyons, a man of great note and eminent piety, who lived not long after the apostles; and *Eusebius Pamphili*; and *Athanasius*, Bishop of Alexandria; and *Amphilochius*, Bishop of Iconium, friend of the blessed *Basil*, in his Iambics to *Seleucus*, expressly declares them *doubtful*. In like manner *Severian*, Bishop of Gabala, in his book against the Jews, rejects them; for as much as *most* men say they are not writings of the apostles, but of *some others*, who were elders only. And, agreeably hereto, *Eusebius Pamphili*, in his ecclesiastical history, says, that at Ephesus are two monuments,

' numents, one of John the Evangelist, and another of
 ' John the Elder, who wrote two of the catholic epif-
 ' tles, even the second and third, inscribed after this
 ' manner, " The Elder to the elect Lady, and the El-
 ' der to the beloved Gaius;" and both he and *Irenæus*
 ' say, that but *two* are written by apostles, even the
 ' *first* of Peter and the *first* of John; and some say, that
 ' neither are *they* written by *apostles* but by *elders* only.
 ' They argue in this manner: The epistles of John are
 ' numbered the first, second, and third, as being all
 ' written by one and the same person. Others receive
 ' the epistle of James together with *these two*, (that is
 ' the first of Peter and the first of John.) Among
 ' the Syrians are found only the *three* before mention-
 ' ed; I mean the epistle of James, the epistle of Peter,
 ' and the epistle of John, they have not the rest. Upon
 ' the whole it does not become a *perfect Christian* to en-
 ' deavour to confirm any thing by *doubtful* books, when
 ' the books in the Testament, *acknowledged by all*, have
 ' sufficiently declared all things *needful* to be known,
 ' concerning the heavens, and the earth, and the ele-
 ' ments, and the whole Christian doctrine.' I presume then
 that the manner in which I understand Eusebius is confirm-
 ed by what is here alleged from Cosmas. Lard. says, [vol.
 5. p. 270, no. 10, sect. 3, form. Ed. 11. p. 276.] ' that, from
 ' the

‘ the entire omission of any mention of *the book of Revelation*,
 ‘ in this work of Cosmas’, which, as it is of some
 ‘ length, and much is there said about the Scriptures of
 ‘ the Old and New Testament, must be an argument
 ‘ that it was not received by him.’ I also observe that,
 whether he received it or not, as it was doubtless *not*
acknowledged by all, which Cosmas makes the *test* of *ca-*
nonical books, he must have deemed it of *dubious* authori-
 ty and therefore improper to be adduced to prove any
 doctrine, or *things needful to be known*. However it
 is likely that he esteemed it spurious, as being in the class
 of those notoriously spurious works, mentioned by Eusebi-
 us, but which in like manner he takes no notice of, as the
 acts of Paul, the shepherd, &c. Amphilochius, [Lard. 4,
 414, form. ed. 9. 148.] says ‘ The Revelation of St. John
 ‘ is approved by some, but the majority (*pleious*) say it is *spu-*
rious.’ The council of Laodicea, A. D. 368, did *not* reck-
 on the Revelations of John in their catalogue of canonical
 books, [Lardner 4 vol. 309. former Edition, 8. 289.] and
 Caius, whom you yourself have quoted, and there-
 fore whom I presume you will deem *good* authority in a
 question of this nature, is so far from attributing this book
 to John the Evangelist, that he affirms it to have been
 the composition of Cerinthus, the heretic. [Lard.
 vol. 2. p. 378, form. Ed. v. 3, p. 32.] It hence evidently
 follows

follows that, unless proofs from apocryphal books be admitted, nothing conclusive, in favour of Christ's divinity, or, contrariwise, can be inferred from the book of Revelations. I shall proceed, however, to notice what you observe from that book.

You say, p. 18. ' Rev. Chap. 5, ver. 8. *And, when he had taken the book, the four beasts, and four and twenty elders, fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and gold vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints.* Some,' you say, ' understand by the four *beasts*, or rather, as it should be translated, the *living creatures*, the Christian Church in the four corners of the world, or the whole body of the faithful; others think that they are hieroglyphical representations of the evangelical nature.' Methinks the conceits of the two famous fathers of the church merited to be noticed: for they, Jerome and Augustine, supposed that the four beasts were symbols of the evangelists, but perhaps you might think this a dangerous exposition; for, were two of the apostles thus employed, perhaps *incredulous* persons might fancy that *two* of the *twelve* thrones, promised by Jesus to his apostles, whereon to sit while judging the twelve tribes of Israel, might be vacant, and, of course, that *two* of them would

be otherwise employed than what he had promised. V.
 Mat. 19. 28. You say, p. 19. ver. 11. “ *And I be-*
held, and I heard the voice of many angels round about
the throne, and the beasts and the elders:— Ver. 12.
Saying, with a loud voice, Worthy is the lamb that was
slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and
strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing. In this the
 angels acknowledge, as the church had done, the in-
 finite merits of the Lord Jesus, the Saviour and Re-
 deemer of the world, who, as such, is worthy of all
 the homage and service which the hosts of heaven can
 give him, throughout the endless ages of eternity.’
 I apprehend that the angels also acknowledge that the
 Lamb *received* power, wisdom, glory, &c. which infers
 great inequality.

Page 20, Ver. 13. “ *And every creature which is in*
heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such
as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I,
saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be
unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the
Lamb, for ever and ever. Here the two Persons in the
 Godhead, Father and Son, are distinguished from each
 other, as they bore distinct parts in the oeconomy of
 our salvation.’ Yes truly are they distinguished here,
 which is more than the modern orthodox do; for, these
 affirm

affirm that Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost, are one, inseparably so; but here a contrary doctrine is set forth, and which will appear still more evident from ver. 6, 7. of this chap. ‘ *And I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne, and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb, as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God, sent forth unto all the earth. And he CAME and TOOK the book out of the right hand of him that SAT upon the throne.*’ I therefore think that the orthodox should thank me for shewing to my readers that this book is *spurious*; for, were it genuine, they must give up their notion of a *trinity* in unity, and of the *equality* of the the Son to the Father. The most inattentive reader can scarcely miss observing, that the Holy-Ghost is entirely omitted in these passages of the evangelist, or author, as much as if he knew nothing of him. That I do not misrepresent the orthodox sentiment respecting the trinity in unity, I trust, will appear from the following passage of Horsley, p. 262. last. ed. ‘ I,’ the bishop says, ‘ maintain, that the *three* persons are *one* Being; one, by mutual relation, indissoluble connection, and gradual subordination: so *strictly* one, that *any* individual thing, in the whole world of matter and of spirit, pre-

‘ sents but a *faint* shadow of their unity. I maintain,
 ‘ that each person, by himself, is God; because each
 ‘ possesses fully every attribute of the divine nature,
 ‘ But I maintain, that *three* persons are all included in
 ‘ the very *idea* of a God; and that, for that reason, as
 ‘ well as for the identity of the attributes in each, it
 ‘ were impious and absurd to say, there are three Gods.²

Page 35. You ascribe the Philopatris to Lucian
 Moyle, with whom Lardner agrees, places it in the be-
 ginning of the fourth century, which, I apprehend, is soon
 enough; for, though I will admit that a *trinity in unity*
 was known in the time of Lucian, yet I believe you will
 find it difficult to shew that it's converse, an *unity in trinity*,
 was known, even for a century after. And, as you ob-
 serve that the whole of the Philopatris is a banter upon
 Christianity, this *last* notion, which the author exercises
 his wit upon, must have been very *common*, for, other-
 wise, the wit would *not* have been relished.

Page 39. ‘ There was,’ you say, ‘ no one in high-
 ‘ er repute, in this century, for soundness of faith and
 ‘ piety of life, than Melito, the Bishop of Sardis. A-
 ‘ bout the year 170, when the persecution began to rage
 ‘ violently against the Christians, he, among others,
 ‘ presented an apology in their behalf to the same empe-

‘ror, (Marcus Aurelius,) wherein he tells him, “ that
 “ they were not worshippers of stones, which are void
 “ of sense, but adorers of the only God, who is before
 “ and above all things, and of his Christ, who is truly
 “ the word of God before all ages.” Intimating that
 ‘ this could not be accounted idolatry in them, as was
 ‘ the nature of that worship which the heathens paid to
 ‘ their gods; but that the adoration of Christ, together
 ‘ with the Father, was in truth the adoration of the true
 ‘ Godhead.’ So then, according to Melito and the reverend
 Prebendary of Ely, the *true Godhead* is composed of the
 Father and Christ. I really thought, with Bp Horsley,
 that the Holy Ghost was a *necessary* ingredient; but,
 I forget, that it is a part of the orthodox faith, that,
 when the Father alone is mentioned, the two other per-
 sons, Son and Holy Ghost, are understood; and that, when
 the Father and Son are mentioned, the Holy Ghost is
 necessarily inferred; and contrariwise: no doubt of it,
 this is a convenient mode to avoid difficulties: in
 this respect, it is equally useful as the two natures in
 Christ. As the orthodox did *not* worship Christ for
 upwards of half a century after Melito, V. n. 22. p. 46.
 pre. disq. it is evident that this passage, teaching a dif-
 ferent practice, must be an interpolation; or, which is

a truth, that it is a spurious writing, forged in the 3d century, and ascribed to a fictitious Bp of Sardis.

Page 62. You say, ‘ Infomuch that Paul Samosate-
 ‘ nus, the heretical Bishop of Antioch, tried to suppress
 ‘ them, [Hymns of Nepos,] by *introducing others in their*
 ‘ *stead.*’ I wish to know, fir, what authority you have
 for this assertion. Lardner says, 3 v. p. 8. form. ed. 4.
 630. and he gives an exact translation of Eusebius, (the
 original being in the margin,) and as it is from the same
 book of Eusebius, it may possibly be the same passage
 which you yourself allude to, ‘ that he had laid aside
 ‘ the hymns usually sung in honour of our Lord Jesus
 ‘ Christ, as *modern*, and the *composition of modern men.*’
 Here is no mention of ‘ *introducing others in their stead.*’

Page 63. What you here allege from Novatus,* not
 Novatian, respecting the omnipresence of Christ, you
 must know may be well answered by a passage from
 Facundus, who affirms, ‘ that, though Mary and Mar-
 ‘ tha, the sisters of Lazarus, thought, that Jesus was
 ‘ *the Son of God*, yet they did not believe him to be God
 ‘ *omnipresent*’ V. History of Opinions, 3 vol. p. 355.
 God forbid that what you farther observe, in the same
 page,

* The reader is requested to look back to n. 23, of the preliminary dis-
 quisation.

page, be well founded, to wit, ' cursed is the hope
 ' that is placed only in man,' for, if Jesus be found
 to have been only a mere man, and you must know
 that this is now the opinion of many learned men,
 in what a miserable predicament the followers of esta-
 blished orthodoxy, as well as the Humanists, throughout
 Christendom, must be !

Page 73. You say, ' In what remains of his (Gre-
 ' gory Thaumaturgus) works there is an ample con-
 ' fession of his faith, or a *creed*, which he framed for
 ' the use of his church, in which he declared his un-
 ' feigned belief in the divinity of God, the Son, and the
 ' Holy Ghost.' So then this creed is *genuine*. Doubt-
 less Gregory Nyssen affirms that he composed and wrote
 it, and that too after he was instructed by John, the
 Evangelist, who, at the instigation of the Virgin Mary,
 the mother of our Lord, taught him the ' mystery of pi-
 ety ;' for *both* these personages *descended from heaven*
 and *appeared* to Gregory, while in deep meditation;
 and, it seems, for this purpose only, according to the
 same Gregory Nyssen, v. Lardner, 3 v. p. 29, &c.
 v. 4, p. 488, form. ed. so that, if you receive one part,
 that the creed was written by Gregory, you should, un-
 less you thought Gregory Nyssen a liar, equally receive
 the

the other, to wit, that the Virgin, and John the Evangelist, personally appeared to him: and why not? You have, I suppose, that good man, the learned Bishop Bull, with you. Would the reader, after this, imagine that Gregory should *be unsound in the faith*, seeing that he was taught by John, at the instigation of the Virgin Mother? Yet, if we credit Basil, the fact is so: for, he affirmed, that Gregory expressed himself ‘*inaccurately about the doctrine of the trinity.*’ Lard. V. III. p. 51. form. Ed. IV. 542.

Page 74. You say, ‘Saint Basil records and defends
 ‘ that formulary of doxology, in which the whole trinity
 ‘ is glorified by the churches under his government;
 ‘ and adds, that the same mode of doxology, which
 ‘ Gregory had instituted, and was handed down by *un-*
 ‘ *doubted* authority, was still observed by the church.’
 In answer to this, I shall cite two paragraphs, from Lard-
 ner, who, in learning, may be deemed equal to the
 Prebendary of Ely. ‘Saint Basil, in all his disputes
 ‘ with the people of Neocæsarea, says nothing of
 ‘ any *written* creed of Gregory. He reminds them over
 ‘ and over of his *Grandmother* Macrina; that blessed
 ‘ and famous woman, sprung from among them, who
 ‘ had the doctrine of Gregory safely preserved in her me-
 ‘ mory, which she likewise as carefully delivered to him
 ‘ in

in his childhood; but not one word of a *written* creed
 deposited with the Neocæsareans. This argument
 appears to me unanswerable; and every one is able to
 judge of it from Saint Basil's epistles, which I have so
 largely transcribed. It appears to me, to a great de-
 gree, probable, that either there was *no written creed* at
 Neocæsarea, reputed Gregory's, or that it was *not*
 to Basil's purpose; otherwise he must have referred to
 it. What good reason can be assigned why, in so
warm a dispute, Basil should so often appeal to the
 instructions he received from his *grandmother* when he
 was a child, but say nothing of a *written creed* in
 Gregory's hand-writing, which he had or might have
 seen or read, when a man, if there had been any such
 thing? Basil, who made so good use of that circum-
 stance, that he had been educated by a relation, his
 grandmother, sprung from among them, to shew the
 Neocæsareans that his faith was the same with that
 of their great Gregory, would have triumphed much
 more if there had been an *authentic written creed*, and
 his sentiments had been agreeable to it. Nyssen, in an
 oration delivered we know not *where* nor to *whom*,
 talks of a creed at Neocæsarea in Gregory's *hand-*
writing; but Basil, in his epistles to the Neocæsareans
 G *themselves,*

‘ *themselves*, mentions no such thing, though extremely
 ‘ to his purpose, much more than any thing said by him.
 ‘ I think it not difficult to know who ought most to be
 ‘ regarded, Basil, or his brother Gregory of Nyssen.’

‘ The creed then in Nyssen is *not* the creed of our
 ‘ great Gregory, but a *fiction* of the 4th Century, after the
 ‘ rise and heats of the controversy about the Trinity; when
 ‘ the whole Church was divided upon that head, and some
 ‘ people were willing to have Gregory on their side, to
 ‘ support their doctrine and manner of expression.’ Lard.
 v. 3, p. 51, form. Ed. v. 4, p. 542. After this I hope
 we shall hear nothing more of this creed. Query, as
 your pamphlet evidently appears to be written for the
unlearned, whether, considering *your* censure upon Lardner,
 it was not incumbent upon you to observe, that this same *creed*
 was questioned by a few. I have frequently understood,
 from modern orthodox writers, that it was only the Soci-
 ians, Arians, &c. who vamped up opinions long since re-
 futed, and published them without ever hinting at the
 refutation. I think, if the orthodox have *hitherto*
 kept themselves free from this imputation, they ought in
 their *present* and *future* publications to secure themselves
 from a retort.

You say, p. 76. ‘ Cyprian abounds in many parts
 ‘ of his works with quotations to this purpose, both from
 ‘ the

‘ the Old and New Testaments ; but his use of that fa-
 ‘ mous text of St. John, 1 Ep. v. 7. the authenticity
 ‘ of which has been so much questioned, and its appli-
 ‘ cation by any of the primitive writers denied, is of
 ‘ all others the most in point. This text he *professedly*
 ‘ cites twice in his works. In his book de *Unitate*
 ‘ *Ecclesiæ*, towards the conclusion, in so many words :
 ‘ “ Of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, it is written, *these*
 ‘ “ *three are one.*” ‘ So far is it from being true, what
 ‘ we hear perpetually suggested, that these words were
 ‘ inserted into John’s text after the Arian controversy
 ‘ was set on foot ; for, Cyprian was dead before that
 ‘ time.

‘ In his Epistle to Jubaianus, he proves that baptism,
 ‘ administered in the name of Jesus Christ only, is in-
 ‘ valid, from the command of our Saviour to baptize
 ‘ all nations in the whole and undivided Trinity : with-
 ‘ out a solemn invocation of these three persons, Father,
 ‘ Son, and Holy Ghost, he continually argues, that the
 ‘ Baptism could be of no effect ; he calls it heretical,
 ‘ and insisted upon a re-baptism, wherever the name of
 ‘ one of them was omitted.—The passage of this Epistle,
 ‘ wherein he disputes so warmly against the admission
 ‘ of those into the Church, who had not been baptized

‘ according to this original form, is very remarkable :
 “ If,” says he, “ a man can be baptised by heretics,
 “ (i. e. effectually,) he may likewise obtain remission
 “ of sins; he may be sanctified, and be made the temple
 “ of God. I ask, of what God? If it be said of God
 “ the Creator, he cannot be his temple without belie-
 “ ving in him. If of Christ, it is impossible, who
 “ believes not Christ to be God. If of the Holy
 “ Ghost, seeing these *three are one*, how can the Holy
 “ Spirit be reconciled to him, who is at enmity with
 “ the Father or the Son?”

I have made this long citation, partly to shew that these passages have not been omitted by Lardner; but my chief view is to consider the famous text of the three witnesses, though it may happen that what I have to say may have little novelty in it. I shall first, however, lay before the reader what Lardner has said upon these two passages cited by you.

‘ There are two passages, where Cyprian is *supposed*
 ‘ by some to quote or refer to the disputed text, respecting
 ‘ the witnesses in Heaven. The first is to this purpose :
 ‘ the *Lord says, the Father and I are one* : Dicit dominus :
 ‘ Ego et pater unum sumus. And again, of the Father,
 ‘ and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, it is written. *And*
 ‘ *these*

‘ *these three are one.*’ I John v. 7. De unitate ecclesiæ,
P. 109.

‘ The other passage I shall not translate : However, I
‘ put it in the margin,* for the sake of those who may
‘ wish to see it here. I do not enter into the merits of the
‘ question, whether this clause be *genuine*, or whether it
‘ was quoted or referred to by St. Cyprian. The reader,
‘ who is desirous of information concerning this matter,
‘ may consult the authors who have treated of it largely;
‘ but in a following chapter will be found an argument
‘ of no small weight in favour of the supposition, that this
‘ clause was *wanting* in St. Cyprian’s copies of St. John’s
‘ Epistle.’

* Nam si baptizari quis apud hæreticos potuit, utique et remissionem peccatorum consequi potuit. Si peccatorum remissionem consecutus est, et sanctificatus est, et templum Dei factus est, quæro cujus Dei. Si Creatoris, non potuit qui in eum non credidit. Si Christi, nec hujus fieri potuit templum, qui negat eum Christum. Si Spiritus sanctus, cum tres unum sint, quomodo Spiritus sanctus placatus esse ei potest, qui aut Patris aut Filii inimicus? Ad Jubaianum. Ep. lxxiii. p. 203. Of which the following is a close translation: ‘ For, if any person can be baptized by heretics, he can surely obtain the remission of sins also. If he has obtained the remission of sins, and is sanctified, and is made the temple of God, I ask, of what God? If of the Creator, he cannot be *his temple* who believed not in him. If of Christ, neither could he be made his temple who denies Christ *to be* God. If of the Holy Ghost, since the three are one, how can the Holy Spirit be reconciled to him who is an opposer either of the Father or of the Son?

‘ Epistle.’ Lard. v. 3, p. 17, form. Ed. v. 4. p. 833.
 The passages alluded to by Lardner are as follow :
 ‘ For John,† teaching us, says in his Epistle, (1 John
 “ v. 6, 7, 8.) *This is he that came by water and blood,*
 “ *even Jesus Christ ; not by water only, but by water and*
 “ *blood. And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because*
 “ *the Spirit is truth. For, there are three that bear wit-*
 “ *ness, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood ; and these*
 “ *three agree in me. I think,‡ likewise, that I have*
 “ *rightly represented the doctrine of the Apostle John,*
 “ *who says, For, there are three that bear witness ; the*
 “ *Spirit, and the water, and the blood ; and these three are*
 “ *one.*”

‘ These quotations shew that this bishop, contemporary
 ‘ with St. Cyprian, had not, in his copies of St. John’s
 ‘ Epistle, the disputed text concerning the witnesses in
 ‘ heaven, and they afford likewise a strong and cogent
 ‘ argument

† Ait enim Johannes de Domino nostro, in epistola sua, nos docens : hic est
 qui venit per aquam et sanguinem, Jesus Christus. Non in aqua tantum,
 sed in aqua et sanguine. Et Spiritus est, qui testimonium perhibet, quia
 Spiritus est veritas. Quia tres testimonium perhibeant, spiritus, et aqua, et
 sanguis. Et isti tres in unum sunt. p. 29. a.

‡ Arbitror autem, et apostoli Johannis doctrinam nos non inepte dis-
 posuisse, qui ait : Quia tres testimonium perhibent, spiritus, et aqua, et
 sanguis, et isti tres unum sunt. p. 30. E. 31. a.

‘ argument for the supposition, that neither had St. Cyprian that text in his copies.’ V. Lard. v. III. p. 195. form. Ed. IV. 883.

I shall now lay before the reader what occurs to me, to shew that the heavenly witnesses are an interpolation. I apprehend that it is universally admitted that John, in this Epistle, had the Docetæ in his eye; the orthodox also affirm, that he had the Ebionites, in which I agree with them. These verses, however, cannot apply to the Ebionites, for they never denied that Jesus had a body, their error lay on the contrary side. That the words were put down at random it would be absurd to affirm: then the writer must have had an *object* in view, and what object could he have in view, except the Docetæ, to whom he particularly alludes in the first verses of the Epistle? Therefore, it may be affirmed, that it was these only that he had in view here. I shall now put down the verses at full length. John says, 1 Ep. v. 6. 7. 8.

“ *This is he that came by water and blood, EVEN Jesus*
 “ *Christ; not by water only, but by water and blood: and*
 “ *it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit*
 “ *is truth. For, there are three that bear record*” [in
 heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost,
 and these three are one. And there are three that bear
 witness

witness in earth,] “ *the Spirit, and the water, and the blood; and these three agree in one.*” Now, supposing that what lies between the crotchets is not an interpolation, to what purpose is it adduced here? The record of the heavenly witnesses could only be for the use of those in heaven, as it strikes me: the angels, having declared the man Jesus to be the Son of God, had no need of the Trinity bearing witness to it, lest they might happen to forget it. Therefore, being useless in regard of the angels, it could only have been of use for the conviction of those Docetæ who had got there; but this is absurd, seeing that salvation is denied to heretics by the ancients, and, methinks, by the writer of these Epistles. Therefore, though the passage relative to the heavenly witnesses was found in every MS. whereas it is scarcely found in any at all, it might be fairly inferred, as having no object, that it was an interpolation. The earthly witnesses (the Spirit, the water, and the blood) prove the reality of the body of Jesus against the Docetæ, and are, therefore, in *point*. I shall observe farther, that, though it were indisputably genuine, Bishop Horsley does not think that it proves a Trinity, and, therefore, supposes that That was the reason why it was so seldom alleged by the ancients
in

in proof of the Trinity. Tracts, Page 325. - The reader, however, will not forget that this passage, whether interpolated or not, can prove nothing, the Epistle having been shewn to be spurious. V. p. 30.

You must excuse me, if I pay little attention to deductions which you or any Christian Commentator may draw from the Talmud, particularly in favour of the doctrine of the Trinity, being perfectly satisfied that the Jews were ever free from such a fancy. Besides, to me it appears evident, that, in their Anointed, or Messiah, or Christ, as we say, they did not imagine that his office would be confined to one person but to a line or succession of persons. For my conviction in this respect I refer you to Mr. David Levi's Letters to Doctor Priestley, who, I think, has also clearly shewn that, though the Jews did even think or expect their Messiah would be confined to one person, Jesus Christ cannot be that one person; and that the orthodox mode of evading the force of some clear Texts of Scripture, which both Jews and Christians apply to the Messiah, is perfectly inadmissible; I mean by a *second* coming of the Messiah. The Texts are as follow, which I take from Levi's 2d Letters, p. 106, &c.

‘ Isaiah xl. 1, 2. Comfort ye, comfort ye, my
 ‘ people, saith your God; speak ye to the heart of (or
 H ‘ comfortably

‘ comfortably to) Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that
 ‘ her warfare (or appointed time) is accomplished, that
 ‘ her iniquity is pardoned; for, she hath received of
 ‘ the Lord’s hands double for all her sins. Jerem. xxxi.
 ‘ 8, 9. Behold I will bring them from the North
 ‘ country, and gather them from the coasts of the
 ‘ earth; and with them the blind and the lame, the
 ‘ woman with child, and her that travelleth with child,
 ‘ together, a great company! They shall come with
 ‘ weeping, and with supplications will I lead them;
 ‘ I will cause them to walk by the rivers of waters, in
 ‘ a strait way, wherein they shall not stumble: for, I
 ‘ am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my first-born.
 ‘ Ibid. xxxiii. 7, 8, &c. I will cause the captivity of
 ‘ Judah and the captivity of Israel to return, and will
 ‘ build them as at first. And I will cleanse them from
 ‘ all their iniquity whereby they have sinned against me,
 ‘ and I will pardon all their iniquities whereby they
 ‘ have sinned, and whereby they have transgressed against
 ‘ me. Ezekiel xi. 16, 17, &c. Therefore say, thus
 ‘ saith the Lord God, although I have cast them far
 ‘ off among the nations, and although I have scattered
 ‘ them among the countries, yet will I be to them as
 ‘ a little sanctuary in the countries where they shall
 ‘ come.

' come. Therefore say, thus saith the Lord God, I
 ' will even gather you from the people, and assemble
 ' you out of the countries, where you have been scat-
 ' tered, and I will give you the land of Israel. And
 ' they shall come thither, and they shall take away all
 ' the detestable things thereof, and all the abominations
 ' from thence. And I will give them one heart, and
 ' I will put a new spirit within you, and I will take
 ' the stoney heart out of their flesh, and I will give
 ' them a heart of flesh, that they may walk in my sta-
 ' tutes, and keep my ordinances, and do them, &c.
 ' Ibid. xxxvi. 12. therefore say unto the House of Israel,
 ' thus saith the Lord God, I do not (this) for your
 ' sakes, O House of Israel, but for my holy name's
 ' sake, which you have profaned among the nations
 ' whither you went, &c. Verse 24. For I will take
 ' you from among the nations, and gather you out of
 ' all countries, and will bring you into your own land.
 ' Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye
 ' shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all
 ' your idols will I cleanse you. A new heart will I
 ' give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, &c.
 ' V. 33. Thus saith the Lord God, in the day that I
 ' have cleansed you from all your iniquities, I will

* cause you to dwell in the cities, &c. xxxvii. 21, 22.
 * And say unto them, thus saith the Lord God, Be-
 * hold, I will take the children of Israel from among
 * the nations whither they be gone, and will gather them
 * on every side, and bring them into their own land.
 * And I will make them one nation in the land upon
 * the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king
 * to them all; and they shall be no more two nations;
 * neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any
 * more at all; neither shall they defile themselves any
 * more with idols, nor with their detestable things, NOR
 * WITH ANY OF THEIR TRANSGRESSIONS; but I will
 * save them out of all their dwelling-places, where they
 * have sinned, and will cleanse them: so shall they be
 * my people, and I will be their God. And David, my
 * servant, (shall be) king over them: and they all shall
 * have one shepherd: they shall also walk in my judge-
 * ments, and observe my statutes, and do them, &c.
 * Moreover I will make a covenant of peace with them;
 * it shall be an EVERLASTING COVENANT with them:
 * and I will place them and multiply them; and will
 * set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore.
 — Surely these predictions have not as yet been accom-
 plished.

P. 82, You say, ‘ That every accusation which was brought against the tenets or the practice of primitive Christians, by their adversaries, was the same in substance with that which Pliny found to be alleged against them from the beginning.’ To which I agree, and deem it no trifling argument against the authenticity of Pliny’s Epistle.

I have now, sir, finished the observations which I proposed to make upon your pamphlet; and, from what I have mentioned in the beginning, you must see that it has been entirely owing to accident, I ever animadverted upon it; neither, I own, would I be at the trouble, except that I apprehended, young persons, unconvertant in theological controversial writings, would conclude, from your observation on Lardner, that his work was NOT so much to be depended on as it struck me it merited; and would thence conclude, that it would be indispensable, in order to attain an exact knowledge of the opinions of the Fathers, to enter upon a continued and regular study of them; a task, considering the number of curious and interesting productions daily coming forth, scarcely within the compass of human virtue. For, how can it be supposed, that a man will sit down to read, I may say, a hundred folios,

folios, in dead languages, when the useful knowledge in the whole can be contained in a nut-shell,—when it is acknowledged, I believe universally, that all the Fathers are more or less interpolated; so that, to find out their real sentiments, requires something more than a knowledge of the dead languages: add to this, that they were never scrupulous of asserting falsehoods to attain their ends; and that I do them no injustice, in this respect, will appear from the following passage of Bishop Horsley. ‘ I will here take the liberty
‘ to remark on the early Fathers in general, whose
‘ memoirs are, nevertheless, to be revered for their
‘ learning and the general *sanctity* of their characters; that in their *popular* discourses, and, in *argument*, they were too apt to sacrifice *somewhat* of the
‘ *accuracy of fact* to the plausibility of their rhetoric;
‘ or, which is much the same thing, they were ready to
‘ adopt any notion which might serve a *present* purpose,
‘ without nicely examining its solidity on its remote consequences.’ Tracts p. 355. S. 10. The meaning of which I take to be that they scrupled not at assertions, either to mislead their *audience*, or to conquer in *argument*; or, more simply, that they scrupled not to *lie*. Therefore, this being the case, (for the bishop is by no means particular
in

in his censure,) who can think of giving up his time to the perusal of works so little likely to reward his trouble. I shall also farther observe, that those persons who have read the Fathers vary so much about what the Fathers say, that, even though a person did discover the real truth, I mean the exact sentiments of the respective ages, in which they wrote, in order to obtain credit for his discoveries, it would require an equal length of time, perhaps, to confute the sentiment and opinions of the moderns, which till done they assuredly deserve equal credit with any assertions of his, independently of the prejudices of mankind, which make all novelties 'kick the beam.' Therefore, this study being too immense and too unprofitable, I apprehend that a reliance may be had on Lardner's representations of the sentiments of the antients, particularly as his translations, which he gives of them, are ever, in important points, accompanied with the originals in the margin, with which they may be compared; and I can affirm, that, having, I believe, compared all his translations, upon material points, with the originals, I only discovered, in one instance, any thing to find fault with, which is in the word *paraplésius*, translated by him *generally*, which implies exception, whereas it means *in like manner*, which

implies

implies no exception. Compare Lard. Vol. IX. p. 322. n. d. & p. 465, n. a. former Ed. Hist. Her. p. 145 & 359.

Therefore, sir, if Lardner has been guilty of management in the compilation of his work, your forming another work upon a similar plan, but introducing into it those passages, on the orthodox side of the question, which Lardner, if he did omit them, was blamable in omitting, it may be then said, that it will be in the power of every reader, who chooses to be at some little pains, to form certain conclusions respecting the sentiments of the ancients upon the most important subject, I mean the Divinity of Christ. But, if I may be allowed to form a judgement, upon what can be done in this line, from your pamphlet, I would say, that the business is already done; Lardner not having omitted any thing of importance of the sentiments of the ancients, upon this or any other material point. Before I conclude, I will take the liberty of submitting to your consideration, the following proposition, but, in what I am going to propose, I trust, that not only you, but every other reader, will acquit me of any design of making any *real* comparison betwixt Jesus and Mohammed: the former I aver to have been a divine messenger, the latter to have
been

been an impostor. What I am going to propose respects only those accounts, which we are taught that we are bound to believe, and place entire confidence in; and therefore in putting the case, I am only attempting to make the reader lay aside, for a moment, his preconceived notions (which I myself, till very lately, entertained) of the indisputable certainty of the authenticity of our four gospels. The case I put is this:

Let us suppose, that a history of Mohammed was put into the hands of a plain man of ordinary capacity, and that it was recorded in this history, that a certain person, named Mohammed, appeared in Arabia about a thousand years ago; who affirmed he was sent to preach to and convert his countrymen; that shortly afterwards he associated to himself ten or twelve persons to be his more intimate companions; that the names of these persons were as follow—John Smyth, George White, Henry Day, James Knight, and so forth; would it not strike him, that it was very singular, or that he did not know before, that the people of Arabia bore the same names in general as the English. Afterwards I shall suppose

* I

this

this same life of Mohammed is put into the hands of a scholar, who being acquainted with the manners and customs of the Arabs, finds, in reading the life, that so far from the Arab manners and customs being represented and preserved in the narrative, that in fact it is only the English manners and customs which are noticed in it. Further, let us suppose, though he may be considerably staggered in his opinion respecting the truth of the narrative from these two awkward circumstances, yet still, as all the Mohammedans affirm, that the book was written by Arabs who attended Mohammed, and therefore could not have been deceived, particularly as lying in such a case, were there a motive even sufficient to induce them to it, would be immediately punished with death; and for the proof of which they asserted, that there were a *continued succession* of respectable authors, who attested, that such a writing *did* exist from their time down to the present, and in the same state in which we have it; or, to speak more clearly, that there are writers, who immediately succeeded his followers, who wrote his life, and who assert, that this life was written by the persons whose names are prefixed

to

to it, and that there are other writers, who immediately succeeded these persons, and who also attest, that such persons did exist, and so on to the present day, so that no doubt could remain of the truth of the historical accounts: yet for his own satisfaction let us suppose, that, without having the least doubt upon his mind, he sits down to read and examine these authorities. How great must his astonishment be to find, that the very persons who are supposed to have succeeded the biographers, upon disputes respecting the person and call of Mohammed, instead of recurring to the *written record*, refer to *tradition*! Do we ever refer to tradition when we have written records? But he will be struck with still greater astonishment to find, those very biographers, who were contemporary with Mohammed, speak of things and opinions which were unknown for half a century *after* their time: or, to say the truth, that their *entire* writings *seem* to have been composed for the confutation of opinions which prevailed long *after* their time. Again, when it is considered, that the writings of the persons who next succeeded the biographers, and their successors for about a century, abound with

opinions which were *not known* for a century *after*, or, if *known*, that those persons, about whose *existence* there can be no doubt, seem not to have so accurate notions of them as their predecessors, which is contrary to the progress of philosophy and knowledge: I say also, that with respect to numbers of those immediate successors of the biographers, we have no accounts but what abound with contradictions, at the same time that the writings attributed to them impute the *cruellest* actions to the most *humane* of mankind *: I say, when all these circumstances are considered, what must he think of the volume? But when to this is added, that many of the followers of Mohammed, particularly his countrymen, who had the best opportunities of arriving at the truth, *disavowed*, and did not acknowledge these writings, as containing a *true* and *just* account; but affirmed, that one of the principal writers of it was neither a *wise* nor a *good* man †—when one of their wisest and most orthodox doctors affirmed, that it was owing to the *authority of the Mohammedan church* that he received the accounts of the associates of Mohammed, as ge-

* Trajan, and Antoninus the philosopher.

† St. Paul,

naive and *canonical**—I say, when all this is considered and known to be fact, will an enquiring Mussulman be blamed for discarding the whole, and seeking out for some other means to account for the existence and growth of Mohammedanism, as every *effect* must have a proportionable *cause*. De te fabula narratur.

I am, &c.

J. E. H.

I shall now proceed to the principal writers in the Horsleyan controversy; I mean the Bishop of St. David, Dr. Priestley, and the late Rev. Mr. Badcock.

If what I have laid down in my Preliminary Disquisition be well grounded, it must strike every person who hath attended to this controversy, that the chief combatants, the Bishop of St. David's, the late Rev. Mr. Badcock, and Dr. Priestley, had no *accurate* or *just* notions of the heresies which sprung up for the first three centuries after Christ; and consequently, did not know what particular opinions respecting Jesus *peculiarly* belonged to each ARCH-HERETIC, and *distinguished* him from other

* Augustine.

Heretics. Their want of knowledge on this head, and their improper use of the term Unitarian (a mere modern term) as descriptive *solely* of Humanism (whereas the Orthodox and Sabellians avowed themselves Unitarians, as well as the Humanists), has thrown great confusion over this controversy: but what has rendered it totally unintelligible, and must for ever have prevented them from bringing it to a proper conclusion, is, that they, and each of them, apply this term to *three* opinions quite *dissimilar*; so that as each, at the time of making an assertion, might have his eye fixed upon one of these opinions, what he asserted might be true with regard to the particular opinion he had in view; whereas his antagonist, having another opinion in view, might with equal truth assert the contrary. The three opinions which they indifferently apply this term to, are the Sabellian, the Humanist, and the Ebionite; so that what might be true with respect to the two former, might be false with respect to the latter; thus, when the Bishop and the late Rev. Mr. Badcock affirmed, that the Unitarians were Heretics, having in their eye the Sabellians and Humanists,

what

what they asserted was very true, and therefore concluded that the Ebionites were in like manner Heretics; for they, as well as Dr. Priestley, supposed, that these held opinions similar, or nearly similar, with the former; and thus we should conclude, that the Bishop and Mr. Badcock were *right* in their assertion, and Dr. Priestley *wrong*. Whereas the Doctor having the Ebionite opinions *only* in view, and finding the Ebionites never called Heretics, meeting with them in the assemblies of the faithful after the council of Nice, whence *as Heretics* they should have been excluded, was certainly well founded in affirming that they were not Heretics*; but, instead of using the term Ebionite, introducing the term Unitarian, and comprehending within its meaning the Sabellians and Humanists, and then affirming, that the Unitarians were not Heretics, or rather could not be Heretics; and his antagonists, not denying the propriety of the term Unitarian as descriptive of the Sabellians and Humanists, as well as the Ebionites, should have admitted, that if the Ebionites were not Heretics, neither were the Sabellians or Humanists: but the full face of history prevented them from

* Vide Preliminary Discourses, n. 28.

admitting

admitting this conclusion; the well-known condemnations of Sabellius and Paul of Samosate, in councils assembled for the purpose, could not be withstood; and supposing that the Ebionites held the same opinions with Paul of Samosate or Sabellius, they necessarily inferred that they too must have been Heretics: so that this controversy, it may be said, in a great measure resulted from none of the persons engaged in it having any just notion of the Ebionite opinions, or what distinguished them from other believers in Jesus, but particularly from the Sabellians and Paulians. Another circumstance has contributed not a little to throw a cloud over this controversy, which is, that the term Heresy, or Heretic, has not been accurately defined, which should have been first done, not according to the notions of the moderns, but according to the *notions of the ancients*, and that too in their own language; so that in entering upon all controversies, or in advancing any thing *new* to the public, no writer should forget, or be regardless of, the counsel of the sage Locke—of accurately defining their terms; for otherwise it may be, that an indeterminate dispute, originating from a misuse of words,

words may arise. If writers could be induced to adopt universally this plan, and by way of recapitulation throw what they have advanced into a few syllogisms at the closure of their works: this would, in the first place, satisfy themselves with respect to the solidity of of what they advanced, and prevent the public from losing its time in attending to ill-digested systems. I cannot avoid here remarking, that what Mr. Locke has written respecting syllogisms has greatly tended to the neglect of them, though I am confident that he never intended it, for they are the infallible rule for trying the truth, or exposing the weakness, of ill-digested writings; and had Aristotle made no other discovery than this respecting the dialectic art, it were alone sufficient to procure him that immortality of which we poor mortals are so liberal.

I must also observe here, that the above gentlemen, I mean the learned Bishop, and Doctor Priestley, do not appear to me to have a certain accurate knowledge of even the Gnostics; for if they had, they should, in controversial writings especially, always make use of the specific term instead of the generic: for what may be very true with regard to one sort of Gnostics, may *not*

be true with regard of the others. Thus, for instance, should an infidel writer treating of the Christians, assert that they believed in transubstantiation and the Pope's infallibility; and another infidel writer assert the contrary, they might enter upon an endless controversy, unless they first made proper distinctions; for the Catholics would support the first, and the Protestants the second, in their assertions. Now these gentlemen are too well versed in controversial, I may say in all accurate writing, not to know that *specific* terms are always to be made use of in preference to generic; and their not doing so in this respect I can only impute to their not being absolutely certain, respecting the several opinions ascribable to each sort. I may also say, that if they had precise notions of the essence (or that which is *the reason why a thing is what it is*) of Gnosticism, Cerinthian, or Jewish, Gnostics had never dropped from their pens; for I may say that the terms *Jewish* Gnostic imply a contradiction; for it being the *essence* of Gnosticism to account for the evil we are sensible, which exists in the world, and the Gnostics ascribing this to the weakness and ignorance, or malevolence of the Demiurg or Creator, the Jehovah
of

of the Jews : or, as the Bishop says, to matter (but which I question), it would be equivalent to a denial of their religion, to the *forgetting* of Moses, which, as already observed, is impossible. What led the ingenious Doctor Priestley astray in this respect, was his supposing, or rather his having *no* doubt, but that Paul's Epistles were written by him in the first century; and finding perpetual allusions in them to the Gnostics, he presumed that they must be Jewish Gnostics to whom he alluded, well knowing that the Gentile Gnostics did not spring up till the reign of Adrian; but the learned Bishop was under no such necessity for his proleptic or prophetic quality, which he ascribes to the Apostles freed him from every such difficulty; yet he admits the Jewish Gnostics, notwithstanding the decisive testimony of Firmilian and Cyprian against the existence of any Gnostics in the apostolic age, See note 18, 19, p. 39, in the preliminary Disquisition ; and thererore I think I am well founded in affirming, that notwithstanding the Bishop's boasting of his knowledge in the Fathers, that nothing new has struck him, respecting the notions entertained by the divers sects of Christians for the first

three centuries different from what has been already delivered by other writers ; and I cannot here forbear observing, that notwithstanding the *imposing* air and *authoritative* tone, which in general pervade his tracts, that he appears to me to have no accurate knowledge upon the points in question between him and Doctor Priestley ; but to have been always led astray by his pre-conceived groundless notions ; and I am inclined to think that ere I come to a conclusion, that I shall convict him of Sabellianism, and if the Orthodox be as *truly in character* such, as ~~in~~ *sentiment* they pretend to be, with the *Orthodox* of the third century, that his Lordship would be deprived of those honours, which, *it is said*, have been the reward of his victory over Priestley ; though I find, notwithstanding the Bishop declares his victory, and talks of the *prostrate enemy*, that the bear's skin is still undecided. What I say respecting deprivation I am far [from being serious in, sincerely wishing he may long enjoy them ; and hoping that That leisure, which affluent circumstances afford, will enable him to enlighten mankind respecting the knotty business of Platonism. After his

Harmony

Harmony of the Unitarians, I could wish for a satisfactory translation of the Parmenides and the Enneads of Plotinus, with explanatory notes, for otherwise they must, I fear, be for ever locked up from me.

Independently of what I have already observed with respect to these two learned and ingenious gentlemen, I think the public have a right to complain, that those passages which they give in support of their opinions, are in general neither *entirely* translated, nor, I may say, *closely*, but are rendered in a sort of paraphrase, which enables them to put their own sense upon the author's words, which they adduce, and which few of their readers are capable of controverting. I think, that such a practice cannot be too severely censured, for it is in fact adducing the authority of ancient writers in support of their own particular notions, or rather making them speak their own sentiments, which is perfectly unfair; for the translation should be as close as possible, and then the reader will draw his own inference without a bias. With regard to those passages, which I shall either in this or any future production lay before my readers, if in a matter purely doctrinal, he must put up with a translation perfectly close and literal, though
even

even it should not be in good grammatical English; as I would dread that in giving it a more elegant turn, that instead of the author's idea I should give him my own; however, other writers if they do not choose to disfigure their pages with inelegances, may at least in the margin give a close translation; but even this I think unfair, nor is it a practice which I mean in any case to follow. I also think, that whatever passage is quoted, that it should be *entirely* translated; for though the part omitted may not contain any thing material, yet without an entire translation the passage is much less satisfactory to those readers, who are incapable of translating it; in truth I think that it had been better if it had not been translated at all. In both these respects I know that these two learned and ingenious gentlemen have failed; but particularly Doctor Priestley, whose translations, I will not say, do not generally express the meaning of the writer, but they are frequently so paraphrastical, that to persons who are not tolerable scholars in Greek and Latin, they are of very little use in arriving at the precise meaning of the original. The Bishop censures Doctor Priestley strongly on both these heads, yet in the few passages

passages given by himself, he errs in *both* respects: and as both these writers are *at home* in the Greek, or nearly so; that is, that they understand it as well as English, I should think it would give neither of them much trouble in adding to their voluminous tracts a few words, without which I will affirm, that the passages adduced by them are of little force. Having premised these remarks, which shew that I mean not to take the part of either in the controversy, which, I acknowledge, where two such eminent scholars are concerned, would be the height of presumption; I shall proceed to the consideration of Bishop Horsley's Tracts, the new edition of which I shall only make use of; for if there be any difference between the first and last editions not having compared them, I cannot say any thing about; yet, I think, that should there happen to be any, it is my notion that the last edition should be solely the object of animadversion; for man being imperfect, it is his duty always to endeavour to grow wiser, and that it would be ungenerous to take advantage of slips in former publications when rectified in latter. To proceed then:

His Lordship's tracts consist of *A Charge to his*
Clergy

Clergy—Letters in Reply to Dr. Priestley—A Sermon upon the Incarnation—Remarks upon the Second Letter of Dr. Priestley—and Six Disquisitions in support of assertions in other parts of the tracts, the whole comprehending nearly five hundred pages octavo in small print. The reader need not be alarmed that it is my intention to follow the Bishop regularly through this laborious performance; indeed, were this my intention, it would require a much larger volume than his own; for, as I have already observed, that wherever he introduces the *Unitarians* and *Gnostics*, which may be in every leaf of his work one with the other, and I am sure not once in ten times right, it would require some words to shew the improper use of the terms, and so this pamphlet would be unmeasurably extended, and defeat its intent; however, if the reader hath read with attention the Preliminary Disquisition, he will be able himself to judge of the truth of my assertion, that not once in *ten* times does the Bishop introduce these terms with propriety; and which the author challenges the Bishop or any of his *expectant* clergy to controvert. Indeed having shewn his Lordship's ignorance with respect to the opinions held by the ancient

Heretics,

Heretics, I might be dispensed, even in his Lordship's judgment, from proceeding farther; for a writer, as his Lordship justly observes, p. 90, of whom it is once proved that he is ill-informed upon his subject, hath no right to a further hearing. And that I have already *proved* his Lordship's being *ill-informed* in this respect, I think cannot be disputed: for I have proved him to be so *not by suppositions* of my *own*, but by the express words of the antients, which he himself admits should be the *only* proof in such matters; however, even this will appear still clearer in the sequel. And in order that my reader may be more sensible of it, in the passages which I shall criticise, where his Lordship makes use of the generic terms of Unitarian and Gnostic, I shall put in crotchets the specific, which ought to have been made use of by his Lordship. This will shew how little dread I have of my cause, it affording my adversary the easiest and most effectual mode for my confutation; an advantage never, I believe, hitherto given by a controversialist to his adversary; but my object is *general truth*, and not victory; therefore by doing this I only act agreeably to my principles, by enabling all parties, whether friends or foes, with the easiest means of arriving at it.

His Lordship by the following passage, I apprehend, frees me from the necessity of a critical examination of his Charge, and of his Sermon, which will considerably shorten this enquiry. His Lordship says, p. 147, “ It is
 “ not allowed by me, that from that time, or in any ages
 “ of the church, the whole body of the Jewish Christi-
 “ ans were distinguished by the name of Narazenes. If
 “ any such *concession* may *seem* to be implied in the *ex-*
 “ *pressions* in which I speak of the Nazarenes in my
 “ Charge (1 §. 12). I *disavow* it. Appealing against
 “ your assertions to the sense of the learned and rever-
 “ end assembly which I had the honour to address, I
 “ rather sought expressions which might convey the ge-
 “ neral part of an opinion common to us all, than such
 “ as might more *precisely* mark the *particulars of my*
 “ *own.*” Hence I infer, that the expressions in these two
 discourses should not with justice to his Lordship be
 critically weighed; and therefore conclude, that I am
 liberated from this part of my task. I own that the
 above passage did not a little surprise me upon the
 first, and every repeated perusal; as, according to my
 weak apprehension, it seems to imply, that, if in his dis-
 course he made use of terms which were not philoso-
 phically just, he conceives he has the liberty to dis-
 avow

avow them, even though afterwards he should think fit to lay them again before the public in print; but besides, is it not singular that he should attempt to make use of terms not *precisely accurate*, and of course which he could not justify, in addressing the “*learned and reverend*,” and as he elsewhere says, “*numerous assembly*?” Is not this tantamount to Origen’s Corporeal Gospel, *V. Pre. Disq. n. 30, p. 56.*—to Chrysostom’s Cheesecakes, *V. Hist. Op. v. iii, p. 128,*—and to Paul’s Milk, *1 Cor. 3. 2.* with which they fed their catechumens or younglings? But such appellations surely cannot apply to his Lordship’s brethren and fellow-labourers in the vineyard of his Saviour! Had not his Lordship entered this protest, I should certainly dispute with him what he asserts, in the beginning of the second page of his Charge, to wit: “That the writings of the Old Testament are only of a *secondary* importance:” for the contrary appears to me to be the *exact truth*, even admitting that the books of the New Testament were free of any objection, and acknowledged even from their supposed time of appearing, to have been received by *all* believers in Jesus as the writings of

those persons to whom they were *ascribed*: for in reading the Old Testament, I do not perceive in it any express reference to the New, or to any other divine writing that should hereafter appear; to which equal authority, much less *greater*, should be given than to the *Law of Moses*, but precisely the contrary. For Moses, in the conclusion of Deuteronomy, prohibits the Jews, in the most express terms, against making any additions *to*, or subtracting any thing *from*, what he delivered to them, and that under the severest temporal calamities; and this was to be a law to them *for ever*. Now, this being evidently the case, it is impossible that the Jews can ever become followers of Jesus, or rather can acknowledge his divine mission, if the necessary consequence is to be, that they are to receive the New Testament, I will not say as *superior* to the Old, nor even *equal* to it, but *at all* as a writing containing the *words of the Deity*. Moreover, in the New Testament I do not find this independency, but, on the contrary, its dependency upon the Old Testament asserted in the clearest and most explicit terms, not by the evangelists and apostles only, but by Jesus himself. The following passages justify what I say: “ I came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil.—As

“ it is

“ it is written in the law, and the prophets, and the
“ psalms—As it is written in the prophet Isaiah, &c.”

I would also observe, except for his Lordship's protest,
that the following passages appear inconsistent. Speak-
ing of Athanasius, his Lordship says,

“ The consideration that “ the Son became Man “ afforded the most ob- “ vious proof that he “ was <i>not</i> the Father. “ P. 23.’	Page 262, he says, “ I “ maintain that the Three “ Persons are <i>one</i> Being; “ one by mutual relation, “ indissoluble connection, “ and gradual subordina- “ tion.”
---	--

The first passage, I apprehend, affirms, that the Son was
not the Father—the other, that he *was*. What follows
is peculiarly curious, to wit: “ *so strictly one*, that any
“ individual thing in the *whole world, of matter or spirit*,
“ presents but a *faint shadow of their unity*, p. 262 :
“ yet this unity or oneness admitted *subordination*,” and
elsewhere he says even of “ *arrangement*.” This is self-
contradictory, and even more palpably absurd than
the explications of the doctrine of the Trinity. This
flower, I have taken out of its place: however, I am apt
to think that we shall have occasion to consider it again;
for

for from it I trust I shall be able to *prove* his Lordship to be a Sabellian, and consequently a *Heretic*. I would also observe, except for the above protest, that in the following passage his Lordship mistakes the Sabellians for Arians. He says, “ And the Sabellians were to “ be convinced that the Word was made flesh, gross, “ corruptible, flesh, before they could be brought to “ acknowledge that he was *God of God*.” I say, that the Sabellians had no occasion to deny this; not that I say that they affirmed it; the phrase was unknown till the rise of the Arian controversy, and could not be applied to the Sabellians with propriety. If I am wrong, it is easy to produce a passage from any of the Fathers of the third century, or beginning of the fourth century, and whose works certainly did *not* appear *before* the Arian controversy. The phrase is peculiarly applicable to the Arians, who denied the consubstantiality, or that Christ was *God of God*, and not against the Sabellians, who affirmed it. I would also observe, except for the above protest, that the passage from Epiphanius, p. 26, is neither *entirely* translated, which you justly censure your antagonist for not always doing, and I will add *not truly* either;

either; but this last point will be more fitly examined hereafter, when we arrive at that passage in your letters where you allude to it. I would also observe, except for the above protest, that Jerome's words, p. 30, do not justify the term *grossfest* in p. 31, and therefore that in this instance you say *more* than your author; who according to yourself was not inclined to make use of the *mildest* epithets when attacking those who differed from him. The passage from Jerome I shall hereafter also consider. I would also observe, except &c. that there is a *seeming* inconsistency in the following passages. You say, p. 35, "It [the word Ebionite] " is not naturally descriptive of *any particular set of opinions*;" but in p. 154, you say, "It was given in contempt: the objects of the contempt were observers of " the Mosaic law; and the *cause* of the contempt was " the *mean opinion* which was entertained by those, that " gave the name, *of expectations built upon legal righteousness*."

I shall now pass to your discourse on the Incarnation, that we may get the *cheesecake business* out of the way, after which we shall proceed to the strong meat designed as an antidote against the " medicated " phials" of that Arch Heretic Priestley. You say,

p. 314, " We are assembled this day to commemorate
 " our Lord's nativity. It is not the birth-day of a
 " prophet that this day is sanctified, but as the anni-
 " versary of that *great event* which has been an-
 " nounced by the *whole* succession of prophets from
 " the beginning of the world ; and in which the *pre-*
 " *dictions* concerning the *manner* of the Messiah's ad-
 " vent received their complete and literal accomplish-
 " ment." I apprehend that your Lordship would
 confer no small favour upon Christians, by laying
 aside the Parmenides, your Harmony of the Uni-
 tarians, and the treatises upon the Principle of
 Vitality, and prove the truth of the above asser-
 tion. I have read some of those passages, I may say
 every one of them, that I understood was applied to
 Jesus, as demonstrating *Him* to be the *Christ* or Mes-
 siah ; and I perceived no ground whatever for such
 an inference. Your Lordship well knows that the
 term *Messiah* means *anointed*, and that none were
 anointed among the Jews, except the *high priest* and
 the *chief temporal ruler* : and Jesus being neither *one*
 nor the *other*, how can the term *anointed* or *Messiah*
 belong to Him, except by such *spiritual* interpre-
 tations which you so justly condemn in Origen and
 others ?

others. Moreover, I defy his Lordship or any of his *expectant* clergy, to produce *one clear passage* expressive of a *suffering* Messiah; and that the unlearned, among whom I rank myself, may be competent judges, let the term supposed to be equivalent to Christ, or the Messiah, be written in common characters, with its meaning and root from any approved Hebrew Lexicon. As the unlearned are to be the judges, no Hebrew characters should be introduced, as they cause confusion of ideas in those persons who cannot read them. I would be also glad to know by what authority we *sanctify* the *day* of the nativity of Jesus? Were it his intention that it should be *sanctified* and kept *holy*, I apprehend, that the day of his birth would have been recorded by *one* at least of the evangelists; but, so far from the *day* of his birth being known, there is a difference among the learned of half a dozen years respecting the *year* in which He was born, as his Lordship well knows—how improbable then that the day of His birth should be known, when the year is unknown! I beg leave to know if there be any mention made in the New Testament respecting the commemoration of this day; and if

there be not, I apprehend that the words in the last chapter of the Revelations will apply to those will-worshippers who keep holy this day.

His Lordship says, p. 327, " St. Luke's Gospel
 " therefore, if the writer's *own* words may be taken
 " about his *own* work, is an historical exposition of the
 " *catechism*, which Theophilus had learned when he
 " was first made a Christian." Truly this is, I apprehend, a *new* and *curious* discovery! What! catechisms so early to explain a religion so very simple! Again his Lordship says, p. 329, " They [Ebionites] questioned
 " not the inspiration of the *books* which they received;
 " but they received only ONE book, a spurious copy
 " of St. Matthew's Gospel, curtailed of the two first
 " chapters." This is a curious passage! So *one* book, with his Lordship, means *books*—they questioned not the inspiration of the books which they received. This inference I don't see: they surely might have acknowledged them as true relations without admitting them to be divinely inspired. But what books did they receive? Eusebius is express that they received none of the books in our canon; and for any others that they might have received, I presume
 his

his Lordship will not stand up an advocate for their inspiration. Moreover, the gross error, mentioned by his Lordship's Scotch correspondent in the very beginning of this spurious Gospel of Matthew, shows that Jewish believers could have no such passage in any book received by them, even in a common history*. It is true that Dr. Lardner, *V.* Article Symmachus, n. c. cites a passage from Eusebius, which he translates as if that learned Ebionite received the Gospel of Matthew, but independently of Valesius, who was as good a Greek scholar as Lardner, understanding it in the very opposite sense, how could Eusebius say that the Ebionites, *without exception*, rejected our books of the New Testament, if Symmachus, who alone, on account of his learning, might be deemed a host (and from whom the Ebionites *received* the name of Symmachians), *received* the Gospel of Matthew. I may add, that the learned Scapula, in his Lexicon, supports the construction of Valesius. I may also add, the absurdity of any one

* The passage alluded to is the very beginning of this gospel: 'It came to pass in the days of Herod, the King of Judea, that John came baptizing with the baptism of repentance in the river Jordan.' Herod the King had been dead thirty years *before* John began to preach: which is such a striking anachronism, as no Jew could be guilty of respecting a recent transaction.

of common sense attempting to prove from Matthew's Gospel, that Jesus was begotten as other persons, from the connection of man and woman, who expressly says, that Joseph knew not his wife till she brought forth. Matt. c. i. v. 25.

I have now gone through these two discourses of his Lordship's, passing by many objectionable passages which I might have noted. There are some of them however, as insisted upon in his letters to Dr. Priestley, and in his Disquisitions, which I shall consider when they again offer themselves. I shall conclude with an extract from the Charge to his Clergy, that "learned and numerous assembly," which he was addressing, as it will afford to some of my readers a specimen of his Lordship's pulpit eloquence. His Lordship, speaking of the *resemblance* between the *doctrines* of *Orthodox Christianity* and those of the *Platonists*, upon some points; and after observing that an enquiry into the cause of it would be both curious and important, says, p. 43, "The enquiry become more important when it is discovered that these notions were by no means peculiar to the Platonic school: that the Platonists pretended to be

" no

“ no more than the expositors of a more ancient
 “ doctrine, which is traced from Plato to Parmenides;
 “ from Parmenides to his masters of the Pythagorean
 “ sect; from the Pythagoreans to Orpheus, the earliest
 “ of the Grecian Mystagogues; from Orpheus to the
 “ secret lore of the Egyptian priests, in which the
 “ foundations of the Orphic theology were laid. Simi-
 “ lar notions of a *triple* principle prevailed in the
 “ Persian and Chaldean theology; and vestiges even
 “ of the worship of a Trinity were discernible in the
 “ Roman superstition in a very late age. This wor-
 “ ship the Romans had received from their Trojan
 “ ancestors; for the Trojans brought it with them
 “ into Italy from Phrygia. In Phrygia it was in-
 “ troduced by Dardanus so early as the *ninth* century”
 [what accuracy!] “ after Noah’s flood. Dardanus
 “ carried it” [it was a heavy burthen] “ from Samo-
 “ thrace, where the personages that were the objects
 “ of it were worshipped under the Hebrew name of
 “ the Cabirim. Who these Cabirim might be has
 “ been a matter of *un-successful* enquiry to many
 “ learned men. The *utmost* that is known with *cer-*
 “ *tainty* is, that they were originally THREE, and
 “ were

“ were called by way of eminence the Great or
 “ MightyONES, for that is the import of the Hebrew
 “ name; and of a like import is their Latin appella-
 “ tion, Penates. Dii per quos penitus spiramus, per
 “ quos habemus corpus, per quos rationem animi possi-
 “ demus. Dii qui sunt intrinsecus, atque in intimis
 “ penetralibus Cœli. Thus the joint worship of Jupi-
 “ ter, Juno, and Minerva, the triad of the Roman
 “ capitol, is traced to that of the THREE MIGHTY
 “ ONES in Samo thrace; which was established in
 “ that island, at what *precise* time it is *impossible* to
 “ determine, but earlier, if Eusebius may be credited,
 “ than the days of Abraham.” This passage may be
 reckoned among his Lordship’s flights. Though I ac-
 knowledge, that it might produce *surprise*, perhaps *asto-
 nishment*, in the sober reader; yet I am inclined to think
 that Longinus would not class it (had this precious
 morsel existed in his time) among those passages which
 exhibit an example of the true sublime.—I am rather
 inclined to think that he would suppose that the
 preacher was *in nubibus*. As I write for the unlearned,
 it may not be improper to mention, that if what his
 Lordship here says be well founded, that then the
 knowledge

knowledge of these THREE *Mighty* ONES must have been preserved by *tradition* about a *thousand* years! for such a length of time is generally admitted to have passed between Abraham and the first Heathen writer. For if Moses, who lived four hundred years after Abraham, has alluded to the *Three Mighty Ones*, the passage has escaped me. Having now finished my animadversions upon his Lordship's Charge to his Clergy, and his Sermon on the Incarnation, I shall proceed to his Letters to Dr. Priestley.

The first point, which I shall enter upon the examination of, is, to which of the heresies John alludes in the following passage: 1 John c. iv. v. 2, 3. "Here-
 " by know ye the Spirit of God: every Spirit that
 " confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is
 " of God; and every Spirit that confesseth not that
 " Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God:
 " and this is that *Spirit* of Anti-Christ whereof ye
 " have heard that it should come, and even now al-
 " ready is it in the world." The question here is, who does the Apostle intend by those who *confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh*? His Lordship says, the Unitarians [that is the Ebionites], Doctor Priestley

Priestley says, the Docetæ, or Marcionites: and that the Doctor is right, and the Bishop wrong, in this particular, must be obvious to whoever has read the Preliminary Disquisition with attention; for therein I proved that the Ebionites, whom the Bishop here calls Unitarians, never believed that Christ had *at all* come; and consequently John could not allude to them, who did *not* believe that Christ came either *in* the flesh, or *out* of the flesh. All Christians, however, believing that Jesus was the Christ, must have believed that Christ came *in* the flesh, or *out* of the flesh; that John does not censure those, who believed that He came *in* the flesh, is clear from the second verse; and that he censures those, who did *not* believe that he came *in* the flesh, is equally clear from the third verse. Now all Christians for the first two centuries believed that Christ came *in* the flesh, except the Marcionites; therefore the Marcionites, or Docetæ, must be those to whom John alludes. I apprehend, then, that I have *proved* that the Doctor's opinion is right. But before I quit this passage I have an observation to make, which is, that as the Marcionites sprung up about the year of Christ 145, it follows, that this epistle could

could not have been written till *after* that time. This must be admitted by those who will not allow of the proleptic or prophetic quality in the Apostles, and therefore it was with good reason that the ancients admitted *not* this epistle into the sacred canon, for the work must be spurious, John being dead at least forty-five years before it was written. That John in the second verse had *only* those believers on Christ in his eye, who thought orthodoxly, or something nearly so, respecting Christ's having come *in* the flesh, is also evident, and of course he could not have the Ebionites in view, as Dr. Priestley imagines, as they did not believe that the Christ had *at all* come, either *in* or *out* of the flesh.

Of the Nazarenes his Lordship speaks thus :

Charge, p. 25.

" He [Epiphanius]
" had described them
" [the Nazarenes] in
" general as a sect *half*
" Christian : not Jews,
" because they had
" something of a belief
" in Christ ; *not* Chris-
" tians, because they
" lived in bondage to
" the ritual law."

Letters to Dr. Priest-
ley, p. 128-9.

" For Hugo Gro-
" tius, Vossius, Spen-
" cer, and Huetius a-
" gree that the Naza-
" renes and Ebionites,
" though sometimes
" confounded, were
" distinct sects ; and
" they maintain the o-
" pinion which I now
" maintain of the *high*
" *orthodoxy* of the pro-
" per Nazarenes in the
" article of our Lord's
" divinity."

Ditto, 147.

" That the name of
" Nazarene was de-
" scriptive of a *heresy*, I
" was confident none
" in that assembly
" doubted."

In the first passage his Lordship only admits the Nazarenes to be, at the utmost, but *half orthodox*, in the second, he maintains them to be *highly orthodox*. In the third, he affirms, as a matter of *notoriety*, that the name was descriptive of a *heresy*. Let his Lordship reconcile those expressions if he can. From this passage I find that Hugo Grotius, &c. with whom his Lordship joins in concert, affirms the *high* orthodoxy of the Nazarenes; that is, that they believed that the *Word* was made *flesh*, or that the *Son* was *equal*, or consubstantiate with the Father: (for I shall make his Lordship a present of the Holy Ghost, as their total ignorance of his proper personality proves that they were, far from being highly orthodox) I therefore would wish to know upon what authority his Lordship, and Hugo Grotius, &c. affirm their *high* orthodoxy? His Lordship knows that explicit testimony is the only test, according to himself, for proving any sentiment supposed to be held by the ancients. To establish this point, *explicit testimony* from the ancients is indispensably necessary; for to attempt to prove it by inferences would be trifling with his readers.

His

His Lordship says, p. 139, " But with Ebion, the
 " denial of the miraculous conception was itself a
 " *first principle*, independent of every thing else."
 This assertion of his Lordship's, is, like hundreds of
 others in these tracts—without proof. I may add
 also, that the assertion is not only *contrary* to the ex-
 plicit testimony of ancient historians, but even con-
 trary to what *his Lordship himself even admits*. That
 it is contrary to the explicit testimony of the ancients
 is proved by what Origen says, and which is quoted
 with approbation by his Lordship, p. 155, whose
 words he thus renders—" These," says Origen, " are
 " the Double Ebionites; who either confess Jesus
 " born of a *Virgin*, in like manner as we do; or
 " think He was *not* born in that manner, but like
 " other men:"—For the original *V. Pre. Disq.* p. 5,
 n. 3. Now if ' the denial of the miraculous con-
 & ception was a *first principle* with Ebion, how
 & came those who *acknowledged* the miraculous con-
 & ception to be called Ebionites?' His Lordship,
 with regard to others, prescribes many rules of which
 he is totally regardless himself; but the cardinal
 one is, that without *explicit evidence* from the an-
 cients,

cients, nothing is *proved*, or should be asserted, for that this is the *sine qua non*, or *only* proof of all assertions. Nevertheless his Lordship's entire performance is filled with assertions without proof, and almost all of them I affirm to be groundless; but in the present instance his assertion is not only contrary to the express evidence of Origen, but even against what himself elsewhere admits; for in page 154, he *asserts*, that the Ebionites, which word signifies *poor*, got this name from the poverty "of expectations built on legal righteousness," without noticing this *first* principle of theirs, a denial of the miraculous conception; besides, his Lordship mentions from Eusebius, p. 382, 'that the *better* sort of Ebionites believed also in the miraculous conception.'

His Lordship says, p. 140, 'but in a subsequent sentence Epiphanius speaks, it seems,' "of the Ebionites as inhabiting the same country as the Nazarenes," and adds, "that *agreeing together, they communicated of their perverseness to each other.*" 'It is true that in the passage which he [Dr. Priestley] has produced, Epiphanius speaks of the Ebionites as the near neighbours of *certain* Nazarenes, and of a resemblance which the vicinity of situation produced,

' duced. But the Nazarenes intended—Were they the
 ' Christian Nazarenes, or the Nasaræan Jews? They
 ' are called “ the lawless Nazarenes [Nazarenoi oi
 anomoi].” ‘ The Christian Nazarenes had nothing in
 ' their conduct that might render them deserving of
 ' this epithet : their error was, that they feared to use
 ' their liberty, not that they abused it. The Nasaræan
 ' Jews, as Jews, were lawless in every emphatical sense,
 ' inasmuch as they renounced the *whole* of the Mosaic
 ' law, *except*, that they *circumcised*, kept the *sabbath*,
 ' and paid some regard to the *state festivals*.’ These
 Nasaræan Jews, whom his Lordship here notices,
 were a curious sort of Jews, who renounced the
 whole of the Mosaic law, except that they retain-
 ed, I believe—I will venture to say, the *greater* part
 of the Mosaic law; for I defy his Lordship to bring
 one clear explicit passage from an ancient writer of
 authority, who asserts that any body of Jews re-
 nounced the Mosaic moral law, and admitted the
 exceptions which his Lordship makes. I would also
 wish to know upon what authority his Lordship renders
 the word Nazarenoi by Nasaræans, contrary to the
 uniform practice of other translators? Is it to im-
 press

press heedless readers, that by making a *sensible* difference in the English words, Nazarenes, and Nasaræans, that an equal difference exists in the Greek. I shall say nothing of *tricks, stratagems, management*, and other *base arts*, which his Lordship is so liberal in imputing to his opponent; but I beg leave to know how it happens that his Lordship renders the word Nazarenoi here by the term Nasaræans, but elsewhere by Nazarenes? And I may say too, in this very paragraph. I am inclined to think that his Lordship was induced to it by the term anomoi, or lawless; his Lordship not being able to perceive how his *highly* orthodox Nazarenes could deserve such an epithet: but the secret is, that these *highly* orthodox Nazarenes *rejected* the *New Law*, alias the *New Testament*, in which this *high* orthodoxy is so clearly set forth, and therefore in the eye of an orthodox Christian, they would deservedly be stiled lawless. I must also observe, that it is only from an inference from Epiphanius's words that his Lordship infers that they rejected the Mosaic law, which shews what little reliance should be placed upon all inferential reasoning, when a person of his Lordship's information

ination and abilities has been shewn to have been so frequently wrong in his inferences : in truth never right.

His Lordship says, p. 145, note, ‘ Dr. Priestley allowing Epiphanius to have been, “ in some things weak enough,” ‘ exults however in the testimony, ‘ which in his chapter against the Arians, he bears ‘ against the Nazarenes as a sect, which, together with ‘ the Ebionites held the doctrine of the simple humanity ‘ of Christ.’ And he says, that in this Epiphanius “ stands uncontradicted by any authority whatever.” Dr. Priestley is mistaken; rashly venturing to assert, ‘ that where no authority is known to him, none is ‘ extant. Epiphanius is in this contradicted, not only ‘ by himself, as I have already shewn, but by a writer ‘ of far superior credit; by Joannes Damascenus, who, ‘ in his book de Hæresibus, says expressly, that the ‘ Nazarenes confessed! Jesus to be the *Son of God*. Damascenus would not have said of Doctor Priestley, or ‘ of any one maintaining the simple humanity of Christ, ‘ that he confesses Jesus to be the Son of God.’ Why not? why not as well as Nicodemus, who, according to Chrysostom, tho’ he called Jesus the *Son of God*, acknowledged him only as a *mere man*? “ Nathanael,” “ he says, confessed Christ as a Man, when he addressed himself

* himself to him, by the *title* of *Son of God*, John i. 49.
 “ as appears by his adding, *thou art the King of Israel*,”
 p. 103. His Lordship says, that Damascenus is an authority far superior to Epiphanius—he may be so with regard to transactions which happened near his own times; but with respect to what happened six centuries before his time, he cannot be deemed authority at all; so that in this respect he is not to be compared, as an authority, to Epiphanius, however contemptible he may be. Epiphanius flourished in the 4th century, Damascenus in the 8th, which alone determines this question.

His Lordship says, that Epiphanius is contradicted by himself, in affirming that the Nazarenes held the simple humanity of Christ. Let the reader judge. The passage upon which his Lordship grounds this assertion, is as follows: “ But concerning Christ
 “ I cannot say, whether they [Nazarenes] think him a
 “ mere Man, or, *as the truth is*, that he was begotten
 “ of Man by the Holy Ghost.” Tracts. p. 26. Your Lordship grounds your assertion upon the words “ *as the truth is*”, as if Epiphanius had asserted, that the truth was, that they affirmed, he was begotten

* Εἰ δὲ υἱὸν Ἰωσηφ αὐτὸν λέγει, μὴ θορυβηθῆς, εἰς γὰρ τέλει παῖς ἐνομισέτο εἶναι. In John. Hom. 18. Op. vol. viii p. 103. Hist. Op. V. iii. p. 68.

by the Holy Spirit: he truly must have been an idiot, in the literal sense of the word, who was capable of asserting in the words immediately preceding, that he did *not* know what their opinions were respecting the mere manhood of Jesus, and in the words immediately succeeding, that he should affirm, that he absolutely *did* know what were their sentiments respecting his Manhood: but independently of this, I will affirm, that "*as the truth is*" is a parenthesis, expressive of the writer's own sentiments, and may be taken away without injuring the sense, which is the *essence* of a parenthesis. Again I affirm, that the Nazarenes, as *Jews*, knew nothing of the Holy Ghost; therefore, though Epiphanius had ascribed this opinion of the miraculous conception to the Nazarenes, which he *does not*, he ought *not* to be believed, as we have better evidence than he to assure us, that the Jews knew nothing at all of the Holy Ghost: moreover, admitting even that the Nazarenes did acknowledge the Holy Ghost, and that Christ was begotten by Him of Mary, yet the Divinity of Christ would not follow, as is evident from the following passage, cited by his Lordship from Origen, which I shall give in his Lordship's

own words, p. 78. “ And when you consider,
 “ what belief they of the Jewish race, who be-
 “ lieve in Jesus, entertain of the Redeemer; some
 “ thinking that he took his being from Mary
 “ and Joseph, some indeed from Mary only, and
 “ the Divine Spirit, but still without *any belief of his*
 “ *Divinity.*” Now as his Lordship admits, that *all*
 the Nazarenes were of the *Jewish race*, it follows,
 that none of the Nazarenes believed in the Divinity of
 Jesus. What then becomes of his Lordship’s *half or-*
thodox, and *highly orthodox Nazarenes?* in fact they are
 totally annihilated; and so they should, as their exist-
 ence depended upon a parcel of vague hypotheses
 resulting from almost invincible prejudice: for the
 greatest men are said to have had their prejudices, and
 his Lordship, as well as Hugo Grotius, &c. is not
 exempt from human weaknesses.

His Lordship says, p. 147. ‘ It is not allowed by
 ‘ me, that from that time’ [the apostolic age] ‘ or in
 ‘ any age of the church,’ that “ the whole body of the
 “ Jewish Christians were distinguished by the name of
 “ Nazarenes.” Let us hear then what the book of
 Acts says, xxiv. 5. “ And we have found this man a
 “ pestilent

“ pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition *among all*
 “ *the Jews throughout the world*, and a ringleader of *the*
 “ *sect of the Nazarenes.*” If *all* the followers of Jesus
 are not here comprehended under the name Nazarenes,
 I shall no longer pretend to understand plain English:
 and if *all*, of course the whole body of the Jewish
 followers of Jesus. *V.* also Pre. Disq. p. 27. n. 16. His
 Lordship says, in reply to Dr. Priestley, p. 155, ‘ You
 ‘ will say, that since we have Origen’s testimony for
 ‘ the universality of the name,’ [Ebionite, as appli-
 cable to *all* Jewish believers, *V.* Prel. Disq. p. 4. n. 2.]
 the argument from the two passages, taken in con-
 nection, may still proceed. If I could admit the uni-
 versality of the name upon Origen’s testimony, I should
 insist that this description of the two-fold Ebionite in
 the 5th book, is not exactly what you take it to be. I
 should remark, that the words, *omoios emin*, “ in
 “ like manner as we do,” make an important branch of
 the character of the milder sort. “ These,” says
 Origen, “ are the Double Ebionites; who either con-
 “ fess Jesus born of a Virgin, *in like manner as we do*,
 “ or think he was *not* born in that manner, but like
 “ other men.” I would maintain, that the words,

“ in like manner as we do,” are equivalent to the
 ‘ words, “ as the truth is;” in Epiphanius’s description
 ‘ of that belief in the miraculous conception, which
 ‘ he says, the Nazarenes, for aught he knew to the
 ‘ contrary, might hold; and I should contend, that
 ‘ Origen maintains with *less* equivocation, of these
 ‘ better Ebionites, what Epiphanius reluctantly con-
 ‘ fesses of the Nazarenes—that they held the Catholic
 ‘ doctrine concerning the nature of our Lord.’ I agree
 with his Lordship, that the phrases, “ in like manner
 “ as we do” in Origen, and “ as the truth is” in Epi-
 phanius, are equipollent; but they are, besides, paren-
 theses expressive of the author’s *own* sentiments, and
 may, in both passages, be taken away without, in the
 smallest degree, injuring the sense. If my reader should
 have the smallest doubt, that this is the essence of a
 parenthesis, Johnson’s dictionary will easily satisfy
 him; therefore his Lordship’s conclusion that the
 Double Ebionites “ held the Catholic doctrine con-
 “ cerning the nature of *the Lord*,” is founded upon two
 passages in Epiphanius and Origen, which only allude
 to the writer’s own sentiments, and not *at all* to those
 of the people whom they are describing. I must ob-
 serve,

serve, that notwithstanding his Lordship is *at home* in the Greek, that this passage is not truly rendered by him; for the Greek words only say “in like manner *with us*”, which is far short of “in like manner as *WE DO*”; for, if this was an exact rendering, there would be some foundation for his Lordship’s inference, that the Double Ebionites ‘held the Catholic doctrine concerning the nature of our Lord;’ for the words “as we do” imply a perfect and entire congruity; whereas the Greek only implies congruity in *one* particular point; that is, that Jesus was miraculously conceived. Had they believed the Catholic doctrine concerning the nature of our Lord, they would have been Christians; which I challenge his Lordship, or any Christian of *any* description whatever, to produce a single passage from a well-informed, I believe I might say, from any ancient author, which explicitly affirms it; therefore Dr. Priestley’s arguments from Origen and Epiphanius stand good; that neither the Ebionites, nor Double Ebionites, nor Nazarenes, believed in the Divinity of our Lord. The reader, I trust, will not forget that the Double Ebionites were shown, p. 5. of the Preliminary Disquisition, to have
been

been Gentile believers, and not Jewish, as his Lordship here supposes.

I have already complained of his Lordship's having misled his readers by inaccurate translations, and of which the above instance from Origen, I apprehend, is a clear proof. I have also complained of *omissions* in his translations, which as censuring the same practice in his opponent, he should be careful of not subjecting himself to a retort: besides there may be some apology for Dr. Priestley, who has introduced hundreds of passages from the ancients into his writings; and therefore he might think, that a regular translating of them all would be irksome to the generality of his readers; and of course might think himself dispensed from entirely translating, and sometimes might think himself at liberty to abridge, them. I mean not this as a defence of the ingenious Doctor, for I think him blameable in both respects. I shall, in the following paragraph, produce an instance of a very material omission in the translation of a passage from Epiphanius by his Lordship, with what intent, or whether with any, he himself and the Deity best know; for I pretend not to such an intimate knowledge of the human heart as entitles me to determine.

The

The following passages from Origen, Epiphanius, and Theodoret, will, I trust, confirm every unprejudiced person, that the terms Nazarene and Ebionite were only nick-names; and that when the first, Nazarene, was made use of by a Jew, that the term comprehended every believer in Jesus. For the reasons assigned by his Lordship, Tracts, p. 154, the unbelieving Jews could never have nick-named the Jewish believers in Jesus, Ebionites: and therefore when the term Ebionite was made use of by Christians, that under it they comprehended not particularly, a sect of Jewish believers, but in fact every Jewish believer of whatever description, which, as luck would have it, was only one with respect to the faith, notwithstanding what Bishop Bull, or Hugo Grotius, Mr. Gibbon, or Bishop Horsley may say; for they all believed, that Jesus was a mere Man, and knew nothing *at all* of his Divinity. This the three following passages, whether taken separately or in connection, indisputably prove. Origen says, speaking of the Ebionites, “ And when you consider the faith of the Jews, who
 “ believe in Jesus, concerning the Saviour, some
 “ thinking, that he was of Mary and Joseph, some
 “ of

“ of Mary alone and the Divine Spirit, *not however*
 “ *with his Divinity**.” Epiphanius says, speaking
 of the Nazarenes, “ But concerning Christ I
 “ cannot tell, whether they, *being impelled by the*
 “ *impiety of the above-named Cerinthus and Merinthus,*
 “ believe him to be a mere Man : or, as the truth is,
 “ affirm, that he was born of Mary and the Holy
 “ Spirit*.” Theodoret, after having before mentioned
 the Ebionites and Nazarenes, says, “ About the same
 “ time Cerinthus was the author of another heresy, or
 “ sect. Having been a long while in Egypt, and
 “ studied philosophical learning, at length he came
 “ into Asia, and gathered disciples, which he called
 “ after his own name. He taught that there is
 “ one God over all, nevertheless he did not make
 “ the world, but some other powers separate
 “ from him, and ignorant of him. He said, in like

* Και επαν ιδης των απο Ιουδαιων πιστευοντων εις τον Ιησυν την
 περι τω σωτηρος πιστιν, οτε μεν εκ Μαρίας κ’ Ιωσηφ οιομενων αυτον
 ειναι, οτε μην εκ Μαρίας μονης κ’ τω θειω πνευματι, & μην και
 μην της περι αυτου θεολογιας. κ. τ. λ. Horsley’s Tracts, p. 78.

* Περι Χριστου δε, ουκ οίδα ειπειν, ει κ’ αυτοι τη των προβιρημενων περι
 Κηρινθον κ’ Μερινθον μοχθηρια αχθεις φιλον ανθρωπον νομιζεσιν. η,
 καθως η αληθεια εχει, δια πνευματος αγιου γεγεννησθαι εκ Μαρίας
 διαβιβαισθαι. Tracts, p. 26.

“ manner

“ manner with the Hebrews, that Jesus was be-
 “ gotten, according to nature, of a man and a wo-
 “ man, Joseph and Mary, but that he surpassed other
 “ men in wisdom, righteousness, and other virtues *.”

Here then we have the *same* opinions concerning the humanity of Jesus, ascribed by Origen to the *double Ebionites*, as to the Ebionites, who were Jewish believers; also to the *Nazarenes* by Epiphanius, who, all acknowledge, were understood by him to be Jewish believers, without any mixture of Gentile; and to the *Hebrews* by Theodoret, which certainly includes every Jew. Can it then be doubted, but that the terms, Nazarenes and Ebionites, in like manner, included every Jewish believer; and that the first was a nick-name given in the beginning of the first preaching of the Gospel by the Jews to all the followers of Jesus, agreeably to the Acts of the Apostles; and that the term Ebionite was another nick-name given by the Christians to those per-

* Τον Ιησὺν δὲ, τοῖς Ἑβραίοις παρὰ πλησίω, εἶπεν κατὰ φύσιν ἐξ ἀνδρός γεγενῆσθαι καὶ γυναῖκος τοῦ Ἰωσήφ καὶ τῆς Μαρίας, σωφροσύνη δὲ, καὶ δικαιοσύνη, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀγαθοῖς διαπρεψαί. H. T. l. II. c. ii. p. 219. Lard. ix. 322, n. d. p. 145.

sons, whether Jews or Gentiles, who thought as the Jewish believers, that the Christ had not AT ALL come; and were contented, agreeably to the import of the name, which in Hebrew signifies Poor, with the *poor*, *mean*, *low* promises contained in the Old Testament, setting at nought the *rich* ones held forth in the Gospel? The term Nazarene, it seems, in the time of Epiphanius, had changed its *original* signification, as from being descriptive of *all* the believers in Jesus, it became synonymous with Ebionite, or one who denied Jesus to have been the Messiah—which is a strong presumptive argument that the opinion held respecting Jesus by the Ebionites, was the same which was at first maintained by the Nazarenes, when that term was descriptive of *all* the believers in Jesus; and, if this be granted, it is the only opinion which ought to be entertained of Him. When the reader considers the times in which these three writers began to flourish—namely, Origen about the year 230—Epiphanius about 368—and Theodoret about the year 423—and will consider the passages in this succession, and will also take into the account what Origen has said of the Double Ebionites, he can, I think, scarcely doubt,

but

but that each succeeding writer had the preceding in his eye. The ‘in like manner with us,’ of Origen, and, ‘as the truth is,’ of Epiphanius, strongly resemble one another in real import. Also, the ‘being impelled by the impiety of the above-named ‘Cerinthus, and Merinthus’ of Epiphanius, and Theodoret’s introducing the opinions of Cerinthus, after mentioning the Nazarenes and Ebionites, induces me to think that Theodoret had Epiphanius’s relation in his eye, who did not know if the Nazarenes were not *impelled by the impiety of Cerinthus and Merinthus to adopt their opinions*. Now if this be allowed, they who are acquainted with, and have felt the force of, the association of ideas, will at once perceive, that had his Lordship translated at length the above passage of Epiphanius, (the part in Italics having been omitted by him,) what Theodoret says, which is translated at length by Lardner, would instantly have sprung up into the attentive reader’s mind, and thus enable him to produce a passage from a respectable Historian, which would totally confute his Lordship’s entire Hypothesis. I will not impute to his Lordship, as I have already observed, “art, tricks,

“ management, stratagem ;” but let his Lordship, if he thinks fit, acquit himself to the public, by assigning his motive for his *omitting* that part of the passage marked in Italics, which could be no difficulty to a person who is ‘ at home’ in the Greek—real scholars will feel the force of this argument, others probably may not. I speak from my own experience, not having perceived the association till I read the entire passage in the Greek, which I found mutilated in the translation, though I believe I may say, that I read the text without examining the notes, two or three times at least. I will not so far affront my own truth, as to say that I acquit his Lordship of every thing wrong in this business. The abilities which his Lordship has displayed in this controversy, besides his *avowed* watchfulness, prevent me from thinking that any thing can be said or done by him in this controversy without a *design*; which implies, that he had an *end* in view.

In the passage cited from Theodoret, I have translated *tois Ebraiois paraplesios*, “ in like manner with the Hebrews,” whereas Lardner translates, “ as the Jews generally do :” it is obvious that *Ebraiois* in English means Hebrews, but this is of little consequence,

quence, Jews and Hebrews being equipollent; but what I complain of is, the word *generally*, which does not imply *universality*; whereas the Greek term *paraplesios* does; and in this manner is understood by Lardner himself in another passage of Theodoret, in which it cannot be taken in any other sense, as will be obvious from the passage itself. Lardner says, paraphrasing the original, “Artemon, called also “Artemas, says Theodoret, *agrees with us* in acknowledging the supreme Deity, and owning Him “to be the Creator of the Universe*.” I have referred to this passage, p. 56.

When I consider the character of Theodoret as an Historian, and that the Jews, or Hebrews, knew nothing *at all* of the Holy Ghost, I cannot avoid being of his opinion, that the Jews, or Hebrews, knew nothing of, nor acknowledged, the miraculous conception; and that Origen was misinformed in attributing to any of the Jewish believers so senseless a notion: for if they did not be-

* Και Αρτεμον δε τις, ον τινες Αρτεμαν ονομαζουσιν, τα μεν κατ'α τον των ολων θεον παραπλησιως ημιν εδοξασεν, αυτον ειρηκως ειναι τω παντι ποιητην, H. F. l. II. c. iv. p. 204. V. ix. p. 465. Hist. Her. 358.

lieve in the separate existence of the Holy Spirit, how could they believe in the miraculous conception, which was caused by the instrumentality of the Holy Spirit? That some other Christian writers should ascribe this notion to the Ebionites, or Nazarenes, is not to be wondered at; for they never hesitated at any untruths: besides, what Origen says might be well deemed sufficient authority to writers like Jerome, who were impetuous and ambitious of writing a great deal, which close examination absolutely precludes;

That the Jews did not believe in the *distinct* personality of the Holy Spirit, the following paragraph from Lardner clearly proves:—He says, “ Jerome
 “ has more than once remarked upon Lactantius,
 “ that in his Epistles*, especially those to Demetrian,
 “ he denies the personality of the Holy Spirit; re-
 “ ferring him, as the Jews *erroneously* do, to the Fa-
 “ ther, or the Son. Jerome says, that in his time

* Lactantius in epistolis suis, & maxime in epistolis ad Demetrianum, spiritus sancti negat substantiam, & errore Judaico dicit eum vel ad patrem referri, vel ad filium, et sanctificationem utriusque Personæ sub ejus nomine demonstrari. Hieron. ad. Pamm. et Oc. xli. al. 65, T. lv. p. 345, Lard iv. 60. form. ed. vii. 143.

“ that

“ * that this was a common opinion with many, who
 “ did not understand the scriptures.”

His Lordship in continuation, See p. 100 of these sheets proceeds — ‘ And in this manner the
 ‘ words of Origen *seem* to have been understood,
 ‘ by both Grotius and Vossius [so then they did not *absolutely* understand them thus See p. 89, 2d, col. where we are told that they were *agreed* and *maintained* their *high* Orthodoxy], when they allow that
 ‘ the Nazarenes, though Orthodox in this part
 ‘ of their faith, are included in this passage of
 ‘ Origen, Book v, in the appellation of Ebionites.’
 [If they allowed this they were wrong, the Nazarenes being Jewish, whereas the Double Ebionites, of whom Origen speaks,

* Hoc ideo, quia multi per imperitiam scripturarum (quod et Firmianus in octavo ad Demetrianum epistolarum libro facit) afferunt, spiritum sanctum sæpe Patrem, sæpe filium nominari. Et cum perspicue in Trinitate credamus, tertiam personam auferentes, non substantiam ejus volunt esse, sed nomen. In Galat. c. IV. v. vi. p. 268. Lardner, ib. V. also Tertullian Pre. Disq. n. 29. p. 54.

were

Gentile believers. See Pre. Dis. p. 5. n. 3.]. ‘ I should
 ‘ contend, if the former passage prove the name gene-
 ‘ ral for the whole body of Hebrew Christians’ [Origen
 says nothing of Christians], ‘ the latter equally proves,
 ‘ that the notion of an Unitarian’ [Humanist] ‘ was not
 ‘ necessarily included in it.’ [Why not? Origen assures
 us, in a passage cited by his Lordship, See Tracts p. 78,
 that whether the Jewish believers *acknowledged* the mira-
 culous conception or not, they were equally *disbelievers*
 of his divinity]. ‘ The connexion therefore of these
 ‘ two passages makes little for your purpose, since the
 ‘ second serves to overthrow the argument which might
 ‘ be built on the first.’ [In the second Origen speaks of
 the Double Ebionites, or Gentile believers in the hu-
 manity of Jesus, which certainly cannot overthrow
 any argument founded on the first, where he speaks
only of Jewish believers]. ‘ It justifies what I have
 ‘ advanced in my charge, upon a *presumption*’ [a presump-
 tion!] ‘ that the first singly would be made the foun-
 ‘ dation of the argument from Origen; that the word
 ‘ Ebionite, in Origen’s time, or at least in *his* use of it,
 ‘ had outgrown its original meaning.’ [A mere presump-
 tion; he was probably the first who introduced the
 term.

term—When, or by what author is the term used in any other sense than that in which it is used by Origen?]

His Lordship proceeds: ‘ In this manner I should
 ‘ combat your argument from these two passages,’
 [Curious upon *presumptions*, when his Lordship assures
 us that *explicit evidence* from the ancients should be
only attended to; with a salvo, I presume, for his Lord-
 ship’s *presumptions*, which should be deemed of supe-
 rior authority] ‘ were it not that I think too light
 ‘ of the testimony of Origen, in what relates to the
 ‘ Hebrew Christians,’ [There is not one word in
 Origen of *Hebrew Christians*, no more than of the
Cherokees *], ‘ to be solicitous to turn it to my own
 ‘ advantage. Let his words be taken as you under-
 ‘ stand them, and so far as the faith of the Hebrew
 ‘ *Christians*’ [Hebrew Christians again! there were
 no Hebrew Christians] ‘ of his own time is in ques-
 ‘ tion, let him appear as evidence on your side.—I
 ‘ shall take what you may think a bold step,’ [It
 truly must be *bold*, when *Priestley* is presumed to

* For this elegant phrase I am indebted to his Lordship, who says, Tracts, p. 487, “ The Jews said so! Origen says nothing of what the
 “ Jews said. There is no mention of Jews, more than of *Cherokees*,
 “ except of Celsus’s fictitious Jew, in this part of Origen’s discourse.”

think that it would be so] ‘ I shall tax the veracity of THIS Origen,’ [This I acknowledge is a bold step from a person who teaches that explicit testimony from the ancients is only to be attended to; ‘ the only proof,’ except as already observed, when his Lordship’s presumptions are in question] ‘ I shall tell *you*,’ [and the world also I apprehend] ‘ that whatever may be the *general* credit of his character, yet in this business the particulars of his deposition are to be little regarded,’ [Why? because they favour not the ill-grounded notions of Bp. Horsley, &c.] ‘ when he sets out with the allegation of a notorious falsehood.’ [Notorious falsehood, Well, let us hear what it is?] ‘ He alleges of the *Hebrew Christians* in general,’ [in his whole works there is not *one* word of *Hebrew Christians*], ‘ that they had not renounced the Mosaic law.’ [None of the ancient Fathers contradict him in this] The assertion served him as an answer to the invective which Celsus had put into the mouth of a Jew, against the converted Jews, as deserters of the laws and customs of their ancestors. The answer was not the worse for *wanting* truth,’ [That
the

the answer was founded in truth, I apprehend the reader can determine] ‘ if his heathen antagonist was
‘ not sufficiently informed in the true distinctions of
‘ the Christian sects to detect the falsehood.’ [Celsus was dead long before Origen wrote] ‘ But in all the
‘ time which he spent in Palestine, had Origen never
‘ conversed with *Hebrew Christians* of another sort?’ [No, never; he knew of no *Hebrew Christians* of any sort whatever] ‘ Had he met with no Christians of Hebrew families of the church of Jerusalem?’ [No, not one; there were none such] ‘ Was the Mosaic law observed? Was it tolerated in Origen’s days, in the church of Jerusalem, when that church was under bishops of the uncircumcision?’ [Hitherto I have seen no sufficient *explicit* evidence to the contrary] ‘ The fact is, that, after the demolition of Jerusalem by Adrian, the majority of Hebrew Christians,’ [Hebrew Christians! Alas! how often are you introduced!] ‘ who must have passed for Jews with the Roman magistrates, had they continued to adhere to the Mosaic law, which to this time they had observed more from habit than any principle of conscience, made no scruple to

‘ renounce it, that they might be qualified to par-
 ‘ take in the valuable privileges of the Ælian colo-
 ‘ ny, from which Jews were excluded. Having
 ‘ thus divested themselves of the form of Judaism,
 ‘ which to that time they had borne,’ [therefore
 there was nothing wrong in it, otherwise they would
 have been informed of their error in this respect by
 the apostles] ‘ they removed from Pella, and other
 ‘ towns to which they had retired, and settled in
 ‘ great numbers at Ælia. The few that retained a
 ‘ *superstitious* veneration for their law’ [*Superstitious*
 veneration for the law of the ALMIGHTY! Could
 a heathen say worse?] ‘ remained in the north of
 ‘ Galilee, where they were joined by *perhaps* new
 ‘ fugitives of the *same weak* character from Palestine.
 ‘ *And this was the beginning of the Nazarenes.*’ [So
 then his Lordship admits that the Nazarenes *became*
 a *sect*, *because* they *retained* the same customs which
 they had kept *since* their first conversion] ‘ But
 ‘ from this time, whatever Origen may pretend to
 ‘ serve a purpose, the majority of the Hebrew Chris-
 ‘ tians’ [Hebrew Christians again] ‘ forsook their
 ‘ law, and lived in communion with the Gentile
 ‘ bishops

* bishops of the new-modelled church at Jerufalem;
 ‘ for the name was retained, though Jerufalem was
 ‘ no more, and the feat of the bishop was at Ælia.
 ‘ All this I *affirm* with the lefs hesitation, being sup-
 ‘ ported by the authority of *Mosheim*,’ [Curious
 enough ! when his Lordship tells us that *explicit evidence*
 from the *ancients* is the only proof to be attended to—I
 presume his Lordship means from his opponents ; but
 evidence, or rather *surmises*, of persons like Mosheim,
 who wrote 16 centuries after the fact, is *explicit* evi-
 dence for his Lordship’s affirmations] ‘ from whom,
 ‘ indeed, I first learned to rate the testimony of
 ‘ Origen, in this particular question, at its true va-
 ‘ lue.’ [So then Mosheim, about what it is clear
 he knew nothing of, is evidence preferable to that of
 all the ancients !]

‘ It is in defiance therefore of the fact, and I fear
 ‘ of his *own* knowledge of the fact, that Origen af-
 ‘ firms of the Hebrew Christians’ [Hebrew Christi-
 ans!] ‘ in *general*,’ [his words imply no exception]
 ‘ that they lived in the observance of the Mosaic
 ‘ law ; and it must be equally in defiance of the
 ‘ fact, that he affirms, that they were all, in gene-
 ‘ ral,

‘ ral, called Ebionites: for he pretends not that
 ‘ this name generally belonged to them otherwise
 ‘ than as Judaizers;’ [that is, for placing their fu-
 ture hopes upon the expectations held forth in the
 law of Moses] ‘ His expressions in the passage of
 ‘ his 5th book *seem to imply* a retraction of both
 ‘ these assertions. For there he speaks of some,’
 [not of the Jewish believers, as his Lordship supposes,
 these *some* were Gentile believers] ‘ who, with the
 ‘ professions of Christianity’ [they professed no such
 thing] ‘ retained the practice of Judaism.’ [This is
 more than Origen says. What he says is, that they
 were *willing*, not that they *absolutely* did so, to live
 according to the law of the Jews] ‘ These *some*,
 ‘ he says, were Ebionites,’ [no; he calls them Double
 Ebionites] ‘ and, which is more, he describes these
 ‘ Ebionites’ [Double Ebionites] ‘ not indeed as
 ‘ universally Unitarians,’ [he truly *does* in his Lord-
 ship’s sense of the term, being only believers in the
 humanity of Jesus] ‘ but as despicable, wretched
 ‘ *Heretics*,’ [there is no such term as *Heretics* in the
 passage adduced by his Lordship from Origen, and I
 will venture to affirm that Origen never applies this
 term

term either to the Ebionites, or Double Ebionites]
 ‘ whose extravagancies could bring no disgrace upon
 ‘ the Christian church, of which they were *no*
 ‘ part.’ [If this be so, then they could not be He-
 retics. *V. Pre. Disq.* note 28, p. 53] ‘ Were the
 ‘ Hebrew Christians, living in communion with the
 ‘ bishop of Jerusalem, in the days of Origen, *no*
 ‘ part of the true church of Christ?’ [No, for *no*
 Hebrew ever believes that the Christ had come]
 ‘ If they were a part of it, in Origen’s own judg-
 ‘ ment, they were *no* Ebionites.’ [But if they were
 not a part of it in Origen’s own judgment, they
 might be Ebionites] ‘ I would not believe this wit-
 ‘ nefs upon his oath, says Mosheim, vending,
 ‘ he manifestly does, such flimsy lies *.’ [I would
 believe this witness without an oath, notwithstanding
 what Mosheim and his Lordship of St. David’s
 say, affirming, as he manifestly does, such obvious
 truths]

I have now transcribed four pages from his Lord-
 ship; the number of errors or mistakes which I have

* Ego huic testi, etiamsi jurato, qui tam manifeste fumos vendit, *me*
 non crediturum esse confirmo. Mosheim de Ebione, § 10.

remarked

remarked are too many to sum up; and I can assure the reader, that I could have extended them. Now, if what his Lordship says be admitted, p. 90, that ‘ a writer, of whom it is *once* proved, that he is ill-informed upon his subject, hath no right to demand a further hearing,’ then this controversy is at an end with respect to his Lordship. But to proceed.

His Lordship says, p. 158. ‘ And this was the beginning of the sect of the Nazarenes.’ His Lordship says, p. 80, ‘ had he’ [Dr. Priestley] read the first sentence to the end, he would have found that ‘ Ebion, although he *arose from* the school of the ‘ Nazarenes, &c.’ His Lordship observes, p. 150, n. ‘ He [Jerome] says, that John wrote his gospel in ‘ opposition to Cerinthus, and other heretics, and ‘ principally the doctrine of the Ebionites, (not then ‘ flourishing, but) *tunc confurgens*, then making *its* ‘ *first* appearance. This I readily allow, &c.’ So then his Lordship asserts, that John, who did not outlive the first century, wrote against the Ebionites, then making their *first appearance*, though they did not arise till about forty years afterwards, according to himself*; that is after the destruction of Jerusalem

by

* See p. 116. l. 16.

by Adrian. His Lordship also says, p. 440, ‘ The
 ‘ Ebionites, therefore, having a place in this
 ‘ list’ [of Irenæus] ‘ by which Simon’ [Magus]
 ‘ is proved the common parent and founder of
 ‘ *all* heresies, unquestionably partook of that cha-
 ‘ racter, which Irenæus makes the peculiar mark
 ‘ of that family.’ His Lordship again says, p. 442,
 ‘ And thus the Ebionites of antiquity, and the
 ‘ Unitarians’ [Humanists] ‘ of our own time, are, in
 ‘ truth, branches, or the offspring at least of Gnos-
 ‘ ticism :’ so then the Ebionites are, according to his
 Lordship, descended from Simon Magus and the
 Gnostics. His Lordship says, p. 129, ‘ And they’
 [Grotius, &c.] ‘ maintain the opinion, which I now
 ‘ maintain, of the high orthodoxy of the proper Na-
 ‘ zarenes in the article of our Lord’s divinity.’ His
 Lordship says, ‘ that Ebion, although he AROSE
 ‘ from the school of the Nazarenes.’ So then Ebion
 AROSE from the school of the Nazarenes, and the
 Ebionites are affirmed to have derived their origin from
 Simon Magus ; it then follows, that the *highly* orthodox
 Nazarenes, from whom they [Ebionites] immediately
 sprung, must have also derived their peculiar notions
 from Simon ; and as the highly orthodox Nazarenes are

acknowledged to be the predeceffors of the modern Orthodox, it follows, that the modern Orthodox, or Trinitarians, had for their founder Simon Magus, that prince of heretics; a goodly origin, truly! I do not know whether I perfectly understand his Lordship's words; but I do know, that I am incapable of wilfully misrepresenting them—to me they appear perfectly clear.

His Lordship, in his eighth letter, admits, in the most explicit terms, that the epistle of Barnabas was *not* written by Barnabas the companion of Paul; and consequently the epistle must be *spurious*; yet from this *spurious* writing, he *proves* the divinity of Christ: but what sort of proof must that be, which is founded upon a *spurious, forged, lying* writing. I beg that the reader will look back to what I have produced on this head in answer to Dr. Knowles, particularly to what Salonius and Cosmas have said. The latter, p. 30, condemns the proving any thing by writings not universally admitted to be genuine by *all* Christians. But his Lordship will say, that though the writing be *spurious*, yet its *age* is certain, and therefore his conclusion is just. But what signifies its age, if we do not know that the writer was well informed

informed upon his subject*; and since we do *not* know who the writer of it was, we cannot be *certain* of this. I will also assert, that a person who dares publish a writing in the name of the companion of Paul, in order to procure to it a credit to which it would not otherwise be entitled, was guilty of such an impious action, that his word should not be taken upon *any* question; and in this sentiment I am supported by Saloni^{us}, *V.* p. 25. I moreover affirm, in opposition to his Lordship, and to Dr. Priestley, if he affirms it, that the epistle of Barnabas was not written in the first century, no nor in the second century, but in the third century after the Sabellian heresy had sprung up: for in this epistle the *sufferings of God* are spoken of; a notion, which sprung up in consequence of the controversy between the Orthodox and Sabellians. The ancients acknowledged this epistle to be spurious, and why? I say because they knew it was a production of the third century. They who will controvert this, let them produce a more probable reason.

His Lordship proves, p. 207, &c. the divinity of

* His Lordship says the Epistle of Barnabas is extravagant and nonsensical in many parts. Tracts, 165.

Christ from the Acts of the Apostles. To make this proof conclusive, he should shew, that the ancients, in like manner, proved his divinity from this book; but the very contrary is the truth, unless his Lordship will affirm, that this book was written after the gospel of John; and if he affirms this, he will be in opposition to all the ancients, who affirm, that to prove the divinity of Jesus, was the *object* of John's gospel; so they of course did not think that the Acts, or any of the other three gospels, taught expressly (whatever the Orthodox may now think), that this doctrine was clearly revealed in them. Moreover, as they affirmed that John's gospel was the *last* written book of our canon, it follows of course, that neither did they think that this doctrine was clearly laid down in any of the other books of the New Testament. However, I will admit, with his Lordship, that the passages in these books adduced by him, and other Trinitarians, clearly prove his divinity; and as the ancients were as clear-sighted in these matters as the moderns are, do not these assertions of theirs seem to justify the reproaches of the Infidels, Celsus, and Julian, and of the Heretics, Marcion, &c. that these books were interpolated, to serve

serve a purpose, by the Orthodox? I find I must once more return to Origen.

His Lordship says, p. 350, 'It is an inconvenience which attends controversy, that it obliges both the writer and the reader to go over frequently the same ground. I must here repeat, what I observed in the seventh of my letters to Doctor Priestley, that it is in answer to a reproach upon the converted Jews, which Celsus had put in the mouth of an unbelieving Jew, that by embracing Christianity they were deserters of their ancient law; that Origen asserts, that the Jews believing in Christ, had not renounced their Judaism. This assertion is made at the beginning of Origen's second book. Now, at no greater distance than in the third section of the same book, the *good* father takes quite another ground to confute his adversary. He insults over his adversary's ignorance, for not making the distinctions, which he himself, in the allegation in question, had confounded.' "It is my present point, says Origen, to evince Celsus's ignorance; who has made a Jew to say to his countrymen, to Israelites believing in Christ; Upon
" *what*

“ *what motive have you deserted the law of your*
 “ *ancestors—but how have they deserted the law of*
 “ *their ancestors, who reprove these that are in-*
 “ *attentive to it, and say, tell me ye, &c*.*?*”

‘Then after a citation of certain texts of Paul’s Epistles, in which the Apostle avails himself of the authority of the law to enforce particular duties, which texts make nothing either for or against the Jew’s assertion, that the *Christians* of the *circumcision* had abandoned their ancient law; but prove only that the disuse of the law, if it was actually gone into disuse, could not be deemed a desertion; because it proceed-

* Νυν δε προκειλαι ελεγξαι την τε Κελση αμαθιαν, παρ ω ο Ιουδαϊος λεγει τοις πολιταις, κ’ τοις Ισραηλιταις πιστευασιν επι τον Ιησυν, το. Τι παθοντες κατελιπετε τον πατριον νομον; κ’ το εξης. Πως δε καταλειποντασι τον πατριον νομον οι επιλιμωνες τοις μη ακουσιν, κ’ λεγοντες. λεγετε μοι οι τον νομον, &c. literally as follows: “ It is now my present point to evince Celsus’s ignorance; by which the Jew says to *the* citizens, and to *the* Israelites, that believe upon Jesus, thus: What did you suffer, that you should forsake the law of your country? and what follows. But how have they forsaken the law of their country, who stigmatize those who do not hearken unto it; and that say, Tell me ye, &c.*?” The reader is requested to compare this exact translation with his Lordship’s. The material differences are marked in mine in Italics, and whether his Lordship, by translating ‘tois politais’ ‘to *his* countrymen’ instead of ‘to the citizens,’ and ‘epi ton Jesoun’ into ‘*in* Christ’ of instead ‘upon Jesus’ has not only mis-translated, but rendered the original agreeably to his own prejudices.

‘ed not from any disregard to the authority of the
 ‘ Lawgiver. After a citation of texts to this purpose,
 ‘ Origen proceeds in this remarkable strain:’ “ And
 “ how confusedly does Celsus’s Jew speak upon this
 “ subject! when he might have said, *more plausibly*,
 “ SOME of you *have relinquished the old customs*, upon
 “ pretence of expositions and allegories. SOME again
 “ expounding, as you call it, spiritually, neverthe-
 “ less observe the institutions of our ancestors. But
 “ SOME, not admitting these expositions, are willing
 “ to receive Jesus as the person foretold by the pro-
 “ phets, and to observe the law of Moses according
 “ to the ancient customs, as having in the letter the
 “ whole meaning of the Spirit*.” “ In these words
 “ Origen

* Και ως συγκεχυμένως γε ταυτὸ παρὰ τῷ Κέλσῳ Ἰουδαῖος λέγει,
 δυναμένος πιθανώτερον εἰπεῖν, οἱ ΤΙΝΕΣ μὲν ὑμῶν κατὰ λελοῖπασί τα
 εθῆ, προφασεῖ διαγνησεων καὶ ἀλληγοριῶν· ΤΙΝΕΣ δὲ καὶ διηγούμενοι, ὡς
 ἀπαγγελλέσθε, πνευματικῶς, εἰδὲν ἡττοῦν τὰ παλῖα τηρεῖτε· ΤΙΝΕΣ
 δὲ, εἰδὲ διηγούμενοι, βεβησθε καὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν παραδεξασθαι ὡς προφητευ-
 θεία, καὶ τὸν Μωυσεως νομὸν τηρῆσαι κατὰ τὰ παλῖα, ὡς ἐν τῇ λέξει
 εἰχόντες τὸν πάντα τὸ πνεῦματος νόμον. The literal translation is as fol-
 lows:—“ And how confusedly does the Jew, in Celsus, say these things,
 “ being able to say more plausibly, that SOME of you have forsaken
 “ the national customs, through a pretext of expositions and allegories:
 “ and

‘ Origen *confesses all* that I have alledged of him. He
 ‘ confesses, in contradiction to his former assertion,
 ‘ that *he knew* of *three* sorts of Jews, *professing Chris-*
 ‘ *tianity.*’ [If the reader will read the passage again,
 he will find that not one of the three sorts professed
Christianity—the two first were unbelieving Jews,
 the latter only received Jesus.] ‘ One sort adhered to
 ‘ the letter of the Mosaic law, rejecting all figura-
 ‘ tive interpretations;’ [and his Lordship might
 have added—but who received Jesus] another
 ‘ sort admitted a figurative interpretation, con-
 ‘ forming, however, to the letter of the precept:
 ‘ but a third sort (the first in Origen’s enumeration)
 ‘ had relinquished the observances of the literal pre-
 ‘ cept, conceiving it to be of no importance in com-
 ‘ parison of the latent figurative meaning.’

‘ But this is not all. In the next sentence he gives
 ‘ us to understand, though *I confess more indirectly,*

“ and SOME expounding spiritually, as you call it, keep the customs
 “ not a whit the less; and SOME not even expounding, are willing
 “ to receive Jesus as the person foretold; and to retain the law of
 “ Moses according to your national customs, as in the letter having all
 “ the meaning of the spirit.” I apprehend that his Lordship’s ‘ He
 ‘ might have said,’ is more than what the original justifies.

‘ but

‘ but *he gives us to understand*; that of these *three* sorts
‘ of *Hebrews professing Christianity*, they only who
‘ had laid aside the use of the Mosaic law, were in
‘ his time considered as *true Christians*. For he men-
‘ tions it as a farther proof of the ignorance of Cel-
‘ sus, pretending, as it appears he did, to deep eru-
‘ dition upon all subjects, that in his account of the
‘ heresies of the Christian church he had omitted *the*
‘ *Israelites believing in Jesus, and not laying aside the*
‘ *law of their ancestors.*’ “ But how should Celsus, he
“ says, make clear distinctions upon this point, who,
“ in the sequel of his work, mentions impious he-
“ resies altogether alienated from Christ, and others,
“ which have renounced the Creator, and hath not
“ noticed [‘ or knew not of’] Israelites believing in
“ Jesus, and not relinquishing the law of their fa-
“ thers*.” ‘ What opinion is to be entertained of a
‘ writer’s

* Αλλά γορ ποθεν Κελσος τα καίρια του τοπου τρανωσαι, ος κη
αιρεσεων μεν αθεν, κη τω Ιησω πανη αλλοτριω εν τοις εξης εμνημο-
νευσε, κη αλλων καλαλιπθων τον δημιουργον· εκ οιδε δε κη Ισραηλι-
τας εις Ιησεν πιστευοντας κη κη καλαλιποντας τον πατριον νομον.—
Which I thus translate; ‘ But how could Celsus accurately explain these

‘ writer’s veracity, who, in one page, *asserts* that the
 ‘ *Hebrews* professing *Christianity* had not renounced
 ‘ the Jewish law;’ [I trust the reader is satisfied that
 there is no such assertion in the passage] ‘ and in the
 ‘ next *affirms*, that a part of them had renounced it,’
 [this part however happens not to have been Chris-
 tians, no, nor even believers in Jesus either] ‘ not
 ‘ *without an insinuation*, that they who had not were
 ‘ *heretics*, not true Christians.’ [So then he *only in-*
sinuates that these Israelites believing in Jesus, and
 who had not abandoned their law, were heretics. It
 must be allowed that the insinuation is very distant; for
 in that part of the sentence relative to the Israelites,
 there is no term like heresy] ‘ EGO HUIC TESTI
 ‘ ETIAMSI JURATO, QUITAM MANIFESTE
 ‘ FUMOS VENDIT, ME NON CREDITIVUM
 ‘ ESSE CONFERMO.’ [With what justice I trust
 ‘ things, who in the sequel of his works hath mentioned atheistical sects,
 ‘ and altogether foreign from Jesus, and others who had forsaken the
 ‘ Demiurg or Creator: and hath not noticed Israelites believing in
 ‘ Jesus, and not relinquishing the law of their fathers.’ From hence it
 appears that Celsus did not write against the Ebionites or Jewish be-
 lievers in Jesus, the *Christians* were *his* object. The Bishop in this pas-
 sage renders *Ἰησοῦς* by Christ, and this is the third instance of such mis-
 translation.

every

every reader of this pamphlet can *absolutely* determine.]

I apprehend that every intelligent reader will be surpris'd how his Lordship could make use of such expressions as 'He' [Origen] 'affirms.' 'He asserts,' when his only foundation for it is, that Origen puts into the mouth of Celsus's Jew, the 'being able ' more *plausibly* to say:—surely *plausibly* is equivalent to speciously, i. e. that which is *not* founded on truth. Then, if what the Jew might say was not agreeable to truth in the opinion of Origen, how can Origen be said, with any appearance of truth, to have *asserted*, to have affirmed, it. I shall also add, that the word *plausibly* is uniformly used in the meaning I assign to it, by his Lordship, in these Tracts, and it occurs more than two or three times; and I see no reason, that in this passage it should have any other meaning, whence his Lordship infers three sorts of Hebrew Christians, but how groundlessly I have already shewn; and that he does not mean even three sorts of believers in Jesus, will be further obvious from the climax in it. Celsus says, some Jews *have* relinquish'd; some *have not* re-

linquished; and some *have not* relinquished, but *also have* received Jesus.

His Lordship returns, in his 5th Disquisition, upon the subject of Origen, and therefore, though I fear my reader is already tired upon this head, I must notice what he says, lest it might be said that what he had therein adduced could not be controverted. In the first place I am to observe, that his Lordship goes upon the principle, that in the above passage, which Origen puts into the mouth of Celsus's Jew, Origen *expressly* mentions *three* different sorts of believers in Christ, whereas I have already shewn that he does not allude to any Hebrew *Christians* at all, two of them only alluding to Jewish *unbelievers*, the other to the Jews, who believed in *Jesus*. However he has something new upon the word plausibly.

His Lordship says, p. 479, 'The plausibility of the
' want of which Origen complains in the discourse of
' Celsus's Jew, is what may be called *poetical plausibi-*
lity.' [This is, I apprehend, a gratuitous assertion,
but let it be admitted] 'It is that general air of
' truth which a writer of judgment and good taste
' contrives to give to the fable of a drama, by an at-
tention

‘ tention to the peculiarities of times, places, man-
 ‘ ners, and characters; a neglect of which stamps a
 ‘ manifest character of clumsy fiction on what ought
 ‘ to seem reality—as would be the case in any serious
 ‘ play, in which the Maid of Orleans should be seat-
 ‘ ed on the Delphic Tripod; or Hugh Peters intro-
 ‘ duced maintaining the divine rights of kings and
 ‘ bishops. This is the want of plausibility with
 ‘ which Origen taxes Celsus. He says that Celsus,
 ‘ with all his great pretensions to learning and taste,
 ‘ knew not the common rules of art about maintain-
 ‘ ing character in the fiction of persons. Το ακολουθῶν
 ‘ ἔκιν οὐδε κατὰ τὸν τόπον τῆς προσωποποιίας. He made his Jew
 ‘ say what no real Jew would have said—that the He-
 ‘ brew Christians *in general* had deserted the law of
 ‘ their ancestors.’ [This he did *not* say, either *in ge-*
 ‘ *neral* or in particular] ‘ This no Jew would have
 ‘ said, because it was a downright falsehood; which
 ‘ every Jew must have known to be such. Had
 ‘ Origen stopped here, he would not have himself
 ‘ betrayed the want of truth in his first assertion,
 ‘ that the *whole body* of the Hebrew Christians retain-
 ‘ ed the *observation of the law*. For the two proposi-
 ‘ tions

‘ tions concerning the Hebrew Christians, that they
 ‘ had *all* forsaken their law, which was Celsus’s
 ‘ Jew’s assertion, and that *none* of them had forsaken
 ‘ it, which was Origen’s, are so completely opposite,
 ‘ that the entire falsehood of the one were perfectly
 ‘ consistent with the entire truth of the other. But
 ‘ Origen, unfortunately for his own credit, goes on
 ‘ to tell his reader, what Celsus’s Jew *might* have said
 ‘ with *more plausibility*, i. e. with *more propriety* of cha-
 ‘ racter—*more consistently* with a Jew’s knowledge of
 ‘ the truth—that is, *more truly* ;’ [How gradually we
 ascend !] ‘ so that *plausibility* and *truth*, in this use of
 ‘ the word *plausibility*, are the very same thing.’ [The
 plain reader has here a curious instance of human
 ingenuity] ‘ Had Celsus made his Jew reproach the
 ‘ Hebrew converts, not, as he did, with a general
 ‘ desertion of their law,’ [He did not reproach the He-
 brew Christians with any such thing; it was of unbe-
 lieving Jews he was speaking] ‘ but with great dis-
 ‘ agreements among themselves, about the extent and
 ‘ duration of its authority,’ [This was never a mat-
 ter of dispute among the Jews] ‘ and the respect due
 ‘ to it under the Christian dispensation, he would
 ‘ have

‘ have made his Jew speak more in character ;’ [quite
 otherwise] ‘ because he would have spoke more con-
 ‘ sistently with what every Jew must have known to
 ‘ be the real state of opinions among the Christians
 ‘ of the circumcision.’ [There were no *Christians* of
 the circumcision ; the Jewish believers in Jesus were
 all of *one* opinion on this head] ‘ Had Celsus’s Jew
 ‘ talked like a Jew upon this subject, he would not
 ‘ have said that all the Hebrew brethren were de-
 ‘ serters of their law ;’ [no more did he] ‘ but he
 ‘ might, *it seems*, with great propriety, have said, that
 ‘ some of them had forsaken it.’ [He could not have
 said it with any propriety, as being a notorious false-
 hood] ‘ This had been very consistent with that *ac-*
 ‘ *curate* information which a Jew might be expected
 ‘ to possess,’ [it would be quite inconsistent with it]
 ‘ consequently Origen should not have said that they
 ‘ all adhered to it.’ [consequently Origen should have
 said, that they all adhered to it] ‘ And his own re-
 ‘ presentation of the fact, when he comes to state it
 ‘ accurately,’ [that is plausibly] ‘ betrays the false-
 ‘ hood of that first assertion.’ [And his own represen-
 tation

tation of the fact is perfectly consistent with what he *plausibly* puts into the mouth of Celsus's Jew.]

Should his Lordship, or any other person, say, that Dr. Priestley himself admits that 'there might be a 'few Jewish Christians' [it should be Jewish believers in Jesus] 'had deserted their former customs :' to this I answer, that it is but barely a supposition, and therefore unworthy attention ; the point is to *prove* it by *explicit testimony from the ancients* ; the 'only proof,' as his Lordship justly observes, that should be attended to. We have the *decisive* and *explicit testimony of Origen*, and other ancients, to the contrary ; and this being so, what respect should we pay to the hypotheses of the moderns in opposition to them.

His Lordship also taxes Origen with deliberate misrepresentation respecting Isaiah, vii. 14. In this passage the word which we translate *virgin*, is affirmed by Celsus's Jew to signify only a *young woman* ; now the Orthodox in Origen's time affirmed, it seems, that the Hebrew word in Isaiah was the *same* as in Deut. xxii. 23. which we translate *damself*, and who must have been a virgin. Now, were the two words
in

in both passages the same in the original Hebrew, the argument of the Orthodox, as much as it depended upon these passages, would be conclusive; but from the manner in which Origen states this objection of the Orthodox, it is evident that he himself, though one of them, thought there was no truth in it: his words are—‘The word Alma, which the seventy have translated into a virgin, and others into a young woman, is put, AS THEY SAY, also in Deuteronomy, for a virgin *.’ The *they* in as *they* say indisputably means the Orthodox, without at all including himself. Now if *os phasi* be equivalent to the Latin, *ut aiunt*, or the French *on* [dit], as his Lordship affirms, what in this case Origen will say is no better than an idle report: and upon this ground, because Origen did affirm the report to be without any foundation, his Lordship repeats that he would not believe him upon his oath. Now I appeal to the unprejudiced reader, whether it is likely, if his Lordship were in the same predicament, that he

* Ε μὲν λέξις ἡ ἀλμα, ἣν οἱ μὲν ἐβδομηκοντὰ μείλιθηφασι πρὸς τὴν παρθενον, ἄλλοι δὲ εἰς τὴν νεανίαν, κείλαι ὥς φασι, καὶ ἐν τῷ Δευτερονόμῳ ἐπὶ παρθενης &c. Cont. Celsum, lib. i. § 34.

would have acted more *candidly*. Let him consider what his Lordship's ingenuity has produced upon the word *plausibly*.

His Lordship says, p. 481, 'That the distinctions ' which Origen says Celsus's Jew might have' [more plausibly] 'put between the Hebrew Christians, were ' differences really subsisting in that body at the ' time, is *strongly* implied in the form of the expression, *dunamenos eipein*,' [doubtless it is; but let us put that unlucky '*expletive*' *pithanoteron*, or *more plausibly*, between them, which, as his Lordship, I presume, *inadvertently* omitted in the text, I have taken the liberty to introduce in crotchets, what then becomes of the strong implications?] 'the force of ' which is very imperfectly rendered in my translation of the passage by the words "when he might " have said." 'It had been *better* rendered, "when " he had it to say." 'The Greek words *dunamenos* ' *eipein*, like the English, "he had it to say," are ' applicable *only* to *substantial facts*, which might safely be averred without danger.' This is truly curious! *Dunamenos* is literally, 'being able;' *pithanoteron*, 'more plausibly,' *eipein*, 'to say;' there is

no difficulty in the words; every school-boy, who can read Greek, must know this. We had an instance just now of plausibly being metamorphosed into *truly*. Here we have another metamorphosis—*dunamenos* instead of being rendered ‘being able,’ is made to signify ‘when he had it.’ I hope the reader will not forget to apply here the concluding observation of the former paragraph.

I shall make no observations upon what his Lordship has said upon Platonism in his 13th letter. He appears to me to understand this *knotty* subject *much better* than any of the Platonists, ancient or modern. I do not, however, perceive the perfect congruity of his Lordship’s making use of the Platonist’s language for the development of Christianity, with Paul’s disavowal of worldly wisdom, that is, Platonist notions, for the same end; or, if as his Lordship says, p. 224, ‘that the Orthodox of the 2d century were Platonizers,’ can I easily perceive but that they must have run counter to Paul’s mode of teaching; and if they were Platonizers in the second century, how happens it that Jerome, who was surely orthodox, disavowed the connection between Orthodoxy and Platonism,

which connection I believe, till revived by his Lordship, has been disavowed by the Orthodox since his time. I should hence infer that the Orthodox, according as they found that it answered a turn, were, or were *not*, Platonists.

Jerome says*, that “the empty words of the philosophers, which killed the younglings of the church in the Platonic doctrines, is turned for them into divine wrath, and into blood.

I have mentioned, that I did not think his Lordship perfectly orthodox, or, in plainer words, that he holds heretical notions—my reason for thinking so is this: his Lordship says, p. 262,

‘ I maintain that the three persons | Fulgentius says †, Sabellius wicked-
‘ are One Being; one by mutual re- | ly joined [the divine persons], and
‘ lation, *indissoluble* connection, and | Arius more wickedly separated
‘ gradual subordination: *so strictly* | [them]. Basil says ‡, “ If any

* Vana Philosophorum verba, quæ in doctrinios Platonius ecclesiæ parvulos interiniebant, in ultionem divinam illis conversa est, et in erorem. In. Pl. 77. Opera, Vol. vii. p. 97. Hist. Op. 1. Vol, p. 290.

† Quia et Sabellius male conjunxit, & Arius sceleratius separavit. ad Pent. p. 719, Hist. Op. iv. p. 218.

‡ Εἰ τις τὸν αὐτὸν πατέρα λέγει, καὶ υἱόν, καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα· καὶ ἐν πρᾶγμα πολυωνυμὸν υποτίθεσθαι, καὶ μιαν ὑπόστασιν ὑπο τῶν τριῶν προσηγοριῶν ἐκφωνημένην· τὸν τοιοῦτον ἡμεῖς ἐν τῇ μερίδι τῶν Ἰουδαίων τασσομεν. Ep. 73. V. iii. 123. Hist. Opin. iii. V. p. 14.

'one, that any individual thing in the whole world of matter and spirit, presents but a faint shadow of their unity. I maintain, that each person by himself is God; because each possesses fully every attribute of the divine nature. But I maintain that these three persons are all included in the idea of a God; and that for that reason, as well as for the identity of the attributes in each, it were impious and absurd to say there are three Gods.

"one says that He [Christ] is Father and Son, and Holy Spirit; and that one thing is supposed under many names, and one substance expressed by three appellations, we place such a one in the portion of the Jews."

Gregory Nazianzen says *, "We therefore worship the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, separating indeed their peculiar qualities, but uniting the Deity: and we do not collect the three into one, lest we should err with the Sabellians, nor do we separate the three into three unrelated and foreign beings, that we may not lessen them with Arius."

Again, speaking of the Supreme Power, he says †, "It is called God, and consists in the three Greatest, the Cause, the Demiurg, and the Perfecter; I say in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Spirit: which are not so removed from one another as to be separated by nature, nor so closely united as to be circumscribed in one person. This is the Sabellian, that the Arian impiety."

His Lordship says, that any individual thing in the

* Προσκυνωμεν ὃ πατέρα, καὶ υἱόν, καὶ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, τὰς μὲν ἰδιοτήτας χωρίζοντες, ἐνὺντες δὲ τὴν θεοτητα, καὶ ὅτε εἰς ἐνὶ τρία συναλειφομεν, ἵνα μὴ τὴν Σαβελλιανὴν νοστον νοσησωμεν. ὅτε δ' αἰρωμεν εἰς τρία ἐκφυλα, καὶ ἀλλότρια ἵνα μὴ τὰ Ἀρεῖαν μανώμεν. Or. 29. Opera, p. 489. Hist. Op. 4. V. 221.

† Καλεῖται δὲ ἡ μὲν θεός, καὶ ἐν τρισὶ τοῖς μεγίστοις ἐστὶν, αἰῶν, καὶ δημιουργῶ, καὶ τελειοποιῶ, τῷ πατρὶ λεγῶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι· ἅ μὴτε ὅπως ἀλλήλων ἀπερίηται, ὡς φύσει τεμνεσθαι· μὴτε ὅπως ἐστῆναι, ὡς εἰς ἐν πρόσωπον περιγραφῆς θαι. Το μὲν γὰρ τῆς Ἀρειανίας, το δὲ τῆς Σαβελλιανικῆς ἀθείας ἐστίν. Or. 24. p. 429. Hist. Op. ib.

whole

whole world of matter and spirit, presents but a *faint* shadow of their unity. Now I apprehend, that as the Sabellians represented this union by the similitude or comparison of a flame, and that for so doing they were condemned for heresy, as joining them *too* closely; much more ought his Lordship to be condemned for heresy, for affirming, that a flame presents but a *faint* shadow of their *unity*!

As it hence evidently appears that his Lordship is a Sabellian—if the reader will examine those passages, indicative of Dr. Priestley's faith, p. 77 Prel. Disq. he will find that the Doctor is also a Sabellian. This must amuse many persons, to find two authors of such established fame, entering into such a violent warfare about a dispute of words, seeing that in the main they are of the same sentiment: for Dr. Priestley presumes, that his sentiment, which is evidently Sabellian, but which he calls *Unitarianism*, was the doctrine taught by the Apostles: And Bishop Horsley entertains no doubt, but that his sentiment (the Sabellian), which he calls *Orthodoxy*, must have been from the testimony of the Apostolical and Primitive Fathers, that doctrine *which was* taught
by

by the Apostles. It is needless after this to make any observation shewing the propriety, I might say the necessity of a publication, to point out to the learned and unlearned (for in this particular, if I may draw a conclusion from these two learned gentlemen, they are at par) the *essential* differences that distinguished the different sects of Christians in the early ages of Christianity; and, satisfactorily to accomplish this great point, no suppositions should be allowed, nothing short of the best authority which the nature of the case will admit of, namely, historians contemporary or nearly so, or other well informed writers who have expressly delivered their sentiments upon the subject. Whether what I have, and will, offer to the public on this head, be satisfactory, the learned will determine.

His Lordship says, p. 111, The gospel is a general revelation; upon which he has the following note:
 “The religion of Christ was an universal religion,
 “and the doctrines of the gospel were calculated for
 “the western, as well as the eastern hemisphere.”
 ‘See Mr. Sheppard’s Preface to his *Free Examination*
 ‘of the *Socinian Exposition of the Prefatory Verses of*
 ‘*St. John’s Gospel.*’ Let us hear then what this religion

gion is; this however his Lordship has not told us; but he says, that ‘The principles of the Christian religion are to be collected, *neither* from a single gospel; *nor* from all the four gospels; *nor* from the four gospels with the Acts and the Epistles; *but from* the whole code of revelation, consisting of the canonical books of the Old and New Testament.’ Is this then a religion adapted for *all* the world, which is contained in not less than a very large folio; and not composed in the plainest language neither? I apprehend that Athanasius had a juster idea of this matter than his Lordship, when he says, “Those who understand the subject are few, but all pious persons may hold the faith delivered to them*.”

Since I have mentioned Athanasius, I don’t think I shall be much blamed for adducing the following passage from him, to shew that he could *not* have been the author of the creed that goes under his name. This is a matter well known to every person of almost any reading, and others have possibly heard of

* Οἱ τὴν μὲν ἀκριβοῦσαν αὐτῆς ἐπιζῆλιν ὀλίγων ἐστὶ, τὴν δὲ πῶς καλεῖται ἀπὸ τῶν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐπειθῶν. De incarnatione Contra P. Samosat. Opera, V. i. p. 592. Hist. Op. iii. V. p. 332.

It, but they who read these sheets will be certain of it. Athanasius says, " That some persons considering " what is human in Christ, seeing him thirsting, labouring, and suffering, and degrading him to a mere " man, sin indeed greatly; but they may readily obtain forgiveness if they repent, alledging the weakness of the flesh; and they have the Apostle himself " administering pardon to them, and, as it were, holding out his hand to them, while he says, *Truly " great is the mystery of godliness, God was manifest in " the flesh* *."

His Lordship says, p. 498, ' The Orthodox of ' the present day well know, that the Son, no less ' than the Father, is *often* characterized in the Old

* Οταν τινες, εις τα ανθρωπινα ελεποντες, ιδωσι τον κυριον διψοντα η κοπιωντα, η πασχοντα κ' μονον φλυαρησωσιν ως και ανθρωπος τε σωτηρος, αμαρτανει μεν μεγαλως. δυναται δε ομως ταχεως μελαγχινωσκειν λαμβανειν συγγνωμην, εχοντες προφασιν την τε σωματος ασθενειαν· εχουσιν γαρ κ' αποστολον συγγνωμην αυτοις νεμοντα, κ' οιοει χειρα αυτοις εν τω λεγειν εκτεινοντα, οτι κ' ομολογηθενως μεγα εστι το της ευσεβειας μυστηριον, θεος εφανερωθη εν σαρκι. In illud Evangelii Quicumque dixerit, &c. Opera, v. i. p. 975. Hist. Op. iii. v. 331. This passage is alluded to, p. 15 of the Preliminary Disquisition. Every person must *feel* that he who wrote it could not have written the dammatory ones at the conclusion of the creed *vulgarly* and *lyingly* called St. Athanasius's.

‘Testament, by the word Jehovah, put absolutely.’ Having never read the arguments by which this *curious* notion is *proved*, and as it is probable I never shall, I will leave this point to the consideration of Mr. David Levi, and they of his nation, to refute: though it is likely that they will think it too absurd to require any notice to be taken of it.

I shall conclude these remarks on his Lordship’s Tracts, with two observations: the first is, that it appears strange to me, that the Orthodox should not be more cautious, and upon their guard against impeaching the veracity of any writers, or bodies of men; seeing how shamefully they have transgressed in this point themselves, even from the first ages of Christianity, ’till, I hope, the present; I cannot say century. That they were given to the most shameless lying and slandering in the earliest ages, is evident from a passage adduced by Mr. Gibbon. It was asserted, “that a new-born infant, entirely covered
“over with flour, was presented, like some mystic
“symbol of initiation, to the knife of the proselyte,
“who, unknowingly, inflicted many a secret and mortal wound on the innocent victim of his error;
“that

“ that as soon as the cruel deed was perpetrated, the
 “ sectaries drank up the blood, greedily tore asunder
 “ the quivering members, and pledged themselves
 “ to eternal secrecy, by a mutual consciousness of
 “ guilt. It was as confidently affirmed, that this
 “ inhuman sacrifice was succeeded by a suitable enter-
 “ tainment, in which intemperance served as a pro-
 “ vocative to brutal lust; till at the appointed
 “ moment the lights were suddenly extinguished,
 “ shame was banished, nature was forgotten; and as
 “ accident might direct, the darkness of the night
 “ was polluted by the incestuous commerce of sisters
 “ and brothers, of sons and of mothers,” *V. i. p. 630*:
 which practices they themselves imputed to the
 Manichees. I shall here add, that when Faustus,
 the Manichee, was entering upon his controversy
 with Augustine, concerning the truth of their respec-
 tive tenets, he challenged Augustine, who himself
 had been a Manichee, whether the base, the horrid,
 and infamously wicked practices imputed by the Or-
 thodox to the Manichees, had any *real* foundation?
 Whether Augustine acknowledged, like a man, that
 they had not, I cannot affirm, it not being mention-

ed by Lardner ; but I fear he did not. Why I cannot exclude the *present* century from the imputation of flandering, will appear from the following fact :—Tindal, in the beginning of this century published a work, entitled, ‘ The Rights of the Christian Church asserted, against the Romish and all other Priests, who claim an independent Power over it ; with a Preface concerning the Government of the Church of England, as by Law established.’—Of this work the famous Le Clerc, in his *Bibliothèque Choisee*, thus speaks : “ We hear that this book has made a great
 “ noise in England, and it is not at all surprising,
 “ since the author of it attacks, with all his might,
 “ the pretensions of those who are called High-
 “ Churchmen ; that is, of those who carry the rights
 “ of the bishops so far, as to make them independent,
 “ in ecclesiastical affairs, of prince and people ; and
 “ who consider every thing that has been done to
 “ prevent the dependence of the laity on bishops, as
 “ an usurpation of the laws against divine right. I
 “ am far from taking part in any particular disputes
 “ which the learned of England may have with one
 “ another, concerning the independent power and au-
 thority

“thority of their bishops, and am still further from de-
 “firing to hurt, in any way, the Church of England,
 “which I respect and honour as the most illustrious
 “of all Protestant churches; but I am persuaded,
 “that the wise and moderate members of this church
 “can never be alarmed at such a book as this, as
 “if the church was actually in danger. I believe
 “the author, as himself says, had no design against
 “the present establishment, which he approves; but
 “only against some excessive pretensions, which are
 “even contrary to the laws of the land, and to
 “the authority of the king and parliament. As I
 “do not know, nor have any connection with him,
 “I have no particular interest to serve by defending
 “him, and I do not undertake it. His book is too
 “full of matter for me to give an abridgment of
 “it, and they who understand English will do well
 “to read the original: they have never read a book
 “so strong, and so supported in favour of the princi-
 “ples which Protestants on this side the water hold
 “in common.”

‘The lower house of convocation, in Queen
 ‘Anne’s reign, thought that such a character of
 “the

“ the rights of the clergy, &c.” from a man of Le
 ‘ Clerc’s reputation for parts and learning, must have
 ‘ no small influence in recommending the book, and
 ‘ in suggesting favourable notions of the principles
 ‘ advanced in it ; and therefore, in their representation
 ‘ of the present state of religion, they judged it expedi-
 ‘ ent to give it this turn ; namely, “ that those *infidels*
 “ (meaning Tindal and others), have procured abstracts
 “ and commendations of their own profane writings,
 “ and probably drawn up by *themselves*, to be insert-
 “ ed in foreign journals, and that they have trans-
 “ lated them into the English tongue, and publish-
 “ ed them here at home, in order to add the greater
 “ weight to their wicked opinions.” Hence a no-
 ‘ tion prevailed in England that Le Clerc had been
 ‘ paid for the favourable account he gave of Tindal’s
 ‘ book ; upon which he took occasion to declare, in
 ‘ a future journal, that “ there never was a greater
 “ falsehood ; and protests, as an honest man, before
 “ God, that, for making mention of that or any
 “ other book, he had never had either promise or
 “ reward.” *V. General Geographical Dict. Art. Tin-*
 dal. After this fact, should I acquit the Orthodox
 of

of *this* century of their old trade of flandering, it may be that the present controversy may make some people imagine that it has not yet quite ceased.

All sects and denominations of Christians *preach up* charity. How comes it then, that it is so little practised? I submit to his Lordship whether his classing Dr. Priestley, whom he acknowledges to have ‘some belief,’ with Bolingbroke, Voltaire, and Gibbon, whom he acknowledges to be Infidels, be christian-like, or charitable?

In making these remarks I have been solely influenced by a love of general truth—if I have unintentionally made use of any expressions unworthy of that cause, they are to be imputed to inattention, not design. His Lordship I have no knowledge whatever of, therefore if any thing should seem personal, I here disavow it. I am no enemy of his Lordship. His writings have instructed me. It is known to a few, I believe, that I have strenuously exerted myself on his Lordship’s behalf, and mentioned that I was ready to defend him in print concerning an absurd opinion, which was ascribed to him, and which,

if

if I did not think that it had been retracted (though I apprehend that in the *same* place where the imputation was made, in the *same* it should have been retracted), I intended that the defence of his Lordship on this head (my own truth being implicated in the question) should have composed a part of this pamphlet; and I will here add, that few persons on earth I have an higher opinion of than of the person who made the charge, though I have no acquaintance with him, but

Veritas super omnia.

I shall now proceed to make a few remarks on Dr. Priestley's History of Early Opinions respecting Christ; for as this work contains the substance of his letters to Doctor, now Bishop Horsley, and as being the later production, it may be supposed to contain his last thoughts, improved by controversy.

What, I apprehend, will first strike the attentive reader after perusal is, whether it be properly entitled to the appellation of a history. What I understand by this term is either a systematic arrangement of the opinions of the ancients respecting Christ, or a chronological arrangement; but neither one or the other is preserved

preserved in this work. In fact, had Dr. Priestley kept to the chronological order, the opinions of his first or primitive Fathers, with regard to the divinity of Christ, would have so far exceeded those of the Fathers, whom he supposed to have flourished after them, that it would have totally annihilated his hypothesis, namely, that the divinity of Jesus Christ was always in *progression*: this, I think, should have made him suspect the solidity of his hypothesis, or rather the age of those Fathers, and is a presumptive argument, if the notion be well founded, that they did not live in so early an age as is generally supposed: indeed I have no doubt of being able to show, or at the least to make it very probable, that not one of the primitive Fathers flourished in the second, but in the third century; it may be, some even later. Had this idea occurred to him, it would have probably led him, from his intimate knowledge of their opinions upon various points, to fix their respective ages *accurately*; and in that case he might have discovered, as would naturally be expected, were his hypothesis well founded, that the systematical and chronological arrangements would have nearly or altogether coin-

cided with it. However this may be, his work must be esteemed highly useful, as containing so many original passages from the Fathers upon most interesting subjects; and though I do not think it a history, I esteem it a most useful and invaluable collection.

Another flaw in this work I take to be the introducing into it passages from apocryphal writings, whose authors being unknown, their time cannot always be absolutely fixed on: as also the introducing passages from writings, which are acknowledged not to belong to the person to whom they are ascribed. In the first class are to be placed the passages from the Clementines, whose author is entirely unknown. Dr. Priestley thinks, that he was an Ebionite, and lived in the second century. However, as the work now stands, it might be clearly shewn that it could not have been the production of an Ebionite, nor written so early as the second century. In the second class are to be placed those passages from the *Philosumena*, by some perhaps ascribed to Origen, but which is obviously not his: indeed the Doctor, I recollect, says in one place, that they are *only ascribed* to Origen; but the reader, who has observed passages ad-
duced

duced from Origen as proofs, when he afterwards finds, that in some cases these *proofs* are taken from a work *ascribed only* to Origen, and I may say too, without any reasonable grounds, immediately all the real knowledge, which he thought he had acquired, he finds is founded upon so sandy a foundation, that, in fact, he is thrown back into all his former doubts; for no one instantly, I apprehend, can immediately separate what was grounded upon genuine writings, from what was grounded upon spurious writings, and most persons are too lazy to return upon the same argument, but rather put up with uncertainties. I own that I cannot but be of the opinion of Cosmas, See p. 30, that as *Christians* ought not to attempt to prove any doctrine except from those books of the New Testament which were **UNIVERSALLY** acknowledged, neither, in like manner, ought any *writer* to adduce passages as proofs, or at all to introduce them into the text, from apocryphal writings, or from writings that are not *universally* acknowledged to belong to the writers to whom they are ascribed. Under this head I must place the books De Præscriptione, ascribed by some to

Tertullian, but which every scholar must perceive not to be his. His own works are extremely difficult to every scholar, whereas there is no extraordinary difficulty in that production. I will venture to affirm that the book *De Præscriptione* was not written before the middle of the third century. It is true the Doctor in one place, perhaps more, speaks doubtfully of this work, as belonging to Tertullian. Bishop Horfley, Dr. Knowles, and Mr. Badcock, argue from it as undoubtedly genuine. I may here add, that Dr. Priestley, throughout his work, constantly writes Novatian, instead of Novatus. That his name was Novatus, and not Novatian, I apprehend to have been demonstrably shewn by Lardner. His Lordship and Dr. Knowles, in like manner, write the name Novatian; yet all these gentlemen acknowledge that they have read Lardner. However, being men of genius, they might think themselves dispensed from attending to such trifling matters: nevertheless Lardner thought it worth his while to return twice upon this subject, trifling as some may think it.

Having premised thus much, I shall proceed to more particular observations, which I shall confine
to

to three heads, namely : — To what the Doctor has said respecting Marcellus—concerning his assertion that the Arians holding that Jesus Christ had no *intelligent human soul was a novelty*—and what he has said respecting the Nestorian heresy.

The Doctor appears to me to think that Marcellus was an Unitarian, that is, according to my definition, a Humanist ; and that he, and Paul of Samosate, held the *same* opinion respecting Jesus Christ ; but the following passages from the Fathers will clearly shew, that Marcellus thought *very differently* from Paul respecting Jesus ; for Paul held him to be a *mere man*, though the Christ ; whereas Marcellus held the same opinion concerning him as had been held before by Sabellius, differing only from this last in a peculiar notion respecting a permanent personification, and subsistence, of the Christ, and the origin of the Holy Spirit : for, as already observed, *V. Pre. Disq. p. 42.* Sabellius held the *resorption* of the Christ *before* the crucifixion into the Deity, on which account, by destroying his proper personification and subsistence, his followers were styled blasphemers of Christ ; and that the Holy Spirit was a protension of
the

the Father, of the *same* nature as the Christ, which possessed the minds of the Apostles, and those others to whom the Father was pleased to impart it : but Marcellus held, that the protension of the Father, which possessed the body of the Man Jesus, so far from being *resorbed* into the Father before his crucifixion *continued protended* ; by which he avoided, by preserving his personality, and subsistence, the being styled a *blasphemer of Christ* ; and with respect to the Holy Spirit, he held, that it was a protension, *from* the protension which made the man Jesus the Christ Jesus ; whereas the Sabellians held the Holy Spirit to be a protension *immediately* springing from the Father. Now, Paul of Samosate, knew nothing at all of these protensions, but esteemed Jesus, the anointed, or Christ, to be a *mere* Man, which shews that there was a material difference betwixt them : in fact, Marcellus was in words a Trinitarian, as asserting the three Persons, and three subsistences, which the others denied. The following passages will clearly prove what is here observed.

But before I proceed farther, I shall first observe, that Dr. Priestley has himself shewn that Marcellus was
in

in the communion of the faithful; nay, even a *bishop*; *V. Hist. Op v. iii. p. 261*, which he could *not* have been, had he held either the opinion of Sabellius, or Paul of Samosate; for both their opinions having been *condemned as heretieal* by councils particularly convened to examine into and determine upon them, there was no need of any other council being assembled, as Eusebius required, to condemn the opinion of Marcellus, had he held the opinions of either; for, as Jerome observes, *V. Pre. Disq. n. 28, p. 53*, every Heretic sprung up in the church, and was cast out of it. Now as Marcellus was *not* cast out of the church, it is evident that his opinions had *not* been declared heretical.

The first passage which I shall adduce to prove that Marcellus held different opinions from Paul of Samosate and Photinus, is from Theodoret, who says, ‘ But he,’ [Marcellus] ‘ said that a certain extension
‘ of the Deity of the Father came into Christ, and he
‘ called this the God-Word. But that *after* the entire
‘ œconomy, that it will be again drawn back, and
‘ centered with God, from whom it extended. But
‘ he says, that the most Holy Spirit is an exten-
‘ sion

‘ fion of the extension, and that this was given to
 ‘ the Apostles *.’

Here we have the tenets of Marcellus by a very respectable historian, who flourished within fourscore years of his time. Now if the reader will look back to p. 42 of the Preliminary Disquisition, he will find that the differences, which I have there marked between Marcellus and Sabellius, are precisely those which are here noticed. We may hence infer, that the tenet, which distinguished the Orthodox, was the asserting the proper and eternal personality and equality of the Three Persons in the Trinity: in the two first Sabellius and Marcellus erred; in the two last Arius. This passage also proves Marcellus’s peculiar manner of thinking respecting the Holy Ghost. I could adduce many passages of the Fathers from the History of Opinions, strictly declarative of the above

* Εκλασιν δε ἵνα της τε παλρος θεοηλος εφησεν εις τον Χριστον εληλυθεναι, κ’ ταυτην θεον λογον εκαλεσε. μελα δε την συμπασαν οικονομιαν παλιν ανασπασθηναι, κ’ συσταληναι προς τον θεον, εξ υπερ εξελαθη. το δε παναγιον πνευμα παρεκλασιν της εκλασεως λεγει, κ’ ταυτην τοις αποστολοις παρασχεθηναι. Hær. Fab. l. 2. c. 10. Opera, vol. 4. p. 224. Hist. Op. iii. 389;

tenets

tenets of Marcellus regarding Jesus Christ; but I shall only add one more passage from Basil, who says, “ You know, my dear brethren, that the doctrine of Marcellus overturns all our hopes, not acknowledging the Son in his *own personality* *.”

Dr. Priestley says, ‘ All the following passages shew that his’ [Basil’s] ‘ strongest apprehensions were from the Unitarians, the disciples of Sabelius, Marcellus, and Paul of Samosate,’ Vol. III. p. 350. This passage, I apprehend, shews, that the Doctor supposes these three persons nearly taught the same, if not entirely the same doctrine; whereas the reader has seen, that their opinions were widely different. I may add too, that the Doctor, throughout his writings, calls the Ebionites Unitarians, and of course one would imagine, that the differences between these four sects were trifling and immaterial; but the truth is, as has been shewn, far otherwise, these last *not* being *even* Christians;

* Οἰδατε ἀδελφοὶ τιμιώτατοι, οἱ πάσης ἡμῶν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀθέτησιν εἷσι το Μαρκιανῶς δόγμα. ὡς υἱὸν ἐν ἰδίᾳ υποτάσει ὁμολογῶν. Ep. 74. p. 126. Hist. Op. 3. V. 351.

believing in Jesus *only* as a Prophet, or a person sent by God, but not at all believing that he was the Christ. *V. Pre. Disq. p. 8. n. 5.* A young author venturing to criticise the writings of so justly celebrated and ingenious a writer, will, he hopes, be excused, in producing a few other passages from his *History of Opinions*, to show, as he apprehends, the confusion of his ideas respecting the ancient Heretics. In using the expression confusion, I mean no disrespect to the Doctor, whom, both as a man and a writer, I highly respect, for the same term applies to every writer, except Lardner, that I am acquainted with upon this subject; even the celebrated Mr. Gibbon* treads cautiously even respecting the Gnostics alone. I shall now adduce those passages which strike me as contradictory, and which indicate confusion of ideas. The Doctor says, Vol. IV. p. 181,

‘ Another circumstance, which made way for the
 ‘ introduction of Arianism, and which greatly
 ‘ contributed to embarrass the Orthodox in the con-

* They [Gnostics] were, almost without exception, of the race of the Gentiles. Gibbon, Vol. I. p. 550.

‘ trovery,

'troverſy, was, that in order to oppoſe the *Sabel-*
 ' *lians*, they had repreſented the Father and Son
 ' as differing *effentially* from each other.' He ſays,
 p. 173, ſame volume, 'The controverſy with the
 ' *Unitarians* had led thoſe who were called Ortho-
 ' dox to ſpeak of Chriſt as *greatly inferior* to the
 ' Father, of which examples enow have been pro-
 ' duced.' Speaking of the three ſyſtems of opi-
 nions reſpecting the perſon of Chriſt, the Doctör
 ſays, p. 167, ſame vol. 'The firſt [ſyſtem] was
 ' that of the *Unitarians*, who believed Chriſt to be
 ' a *mere man*, and to have had no exiſtence prior to
 ' his birth, in the reign of Auguſtus.' He ſays,
 p. 200, ſame vol. 'The Orthodox conſidered them-
 ' ſelves as holding a *middle* opinion between the
 ' *Sabellians* and Arians, the former confounding
 ' the Three Perſons, and the latter ſeparating them
 ' too far; the former making *too much* of Chriſt,
 ' and the latter too little.' In the firſt and ſecond
 paſſages, it is evident, the Doctör preſumes, that the
 Sabellians and Unitarians were the ſame ſect, and of
 which examples enough could be produced beſides
 this. In the third paſſage he ſays, that the Unitari-
 ans

rians believed Christ to be a *mere man*; and as by the two first passages, the Sabellians were Unitarians, they must of course have held the same opinion, that Christ was a *mere man*: but in the fourth passage, he says, ‘ the Orthodox considered themselves as holding a *middle* opinion between the Sabellians and Arians, the former making too much of him.’ [Christ] Truly this was singular, when they only thought him a *mere Man*!

I shall now consider the Doctor’s *assertion*: he says, ‘ But it is remarkable, that all the Fathers, till the time of Arius, held that Christ had a proper human soul, as well as a human body.’ Hist. Op. ii. 198. By a *proper human soul*, the Doctor means the *intelligent principle*.

The Doctor very properly first states the opinions of the Fathers who flourished *before* the Council of Nice, and then of those who flourished *after* it—I shall follow the same mode: first, premising my own opinion, namely, that the doctrine, that Jesus Christ had NO *intelligent* human soul, was NOT a *novelty* before Arius, it being held by all the Orthodox, except, perhaps, by Tertullian: and that ’till
the

the Council of Alexandria A. D. 431, the doctrine of an intelligent human soul in Christ was not *established*: and this I undertake to make good from the passages cited by the Doctor himself, in his History of Opinions. Before we proceed, it is necessary the reader should firmly recollect what was said in the preface respecting the composition of Man, namely, that Man was composed of inanimate body—of a living principle, called by the Greek, *Psyche*, and which the Latins rendered by *Anima*, and which, united to the *inanimate* body, made it a *living* body—and of an intelligent principle, called by the Greeks *Nous*, and which the Latins called *Animus*, this united to the living body, rendered it, according to them, *rational*. From the poverty of our language, we render both *Psyche* and *Nous* by the same term—Soul.

The first passage adduced by the Doctor is from Clemens Romanus, who says, “ Christ our Lord, “ by the will of God, gave his blood for us, his “ flesh for our flesh, and his soul” [*Psyche*] “ for our “ souls.” [*Psyche*] * In this passage there is no men-

* Το αιμα αυτου εδωκεν υπερ ημων ο κυριος ημων, εν θεληματι θειω, κη την σαρκα υπερ της σαρκος ημων, κη την ψυχην υπερ των ψυχων ημων. Sect. xlix. p. 175. Hist. Op. v. ii. p. 203:

tion of the *intelligent* soul. The next passage is from Justin Martyr, who says, “ It appears that our
 “ doctrine was more sublime than every human
 “ doctrine, because the entire rational Christ who
 “ appeared for us, consisted of body, and logos, and
 “ soul.” [Psyche] There is no intelligent principle here. This passage clearly shows, that Justin Martyr thought that Christ was composed of body, a carnal soul, and the logos or divine principle, and of course that he had no intelligent principle.

The next passage which the Doctor adduces is from Irenæus, who says, “ the prophets preached his
 “ coming according to the flesh, by which he was
 “ made a mixture and union of God and Man *.”

The next passage is from the same writer, who says, “ If he was not made that which we are, he did
 “ no great matter in suffering and supporting” [his state]; “ but we having received, as every one whatsoever will confess, a body from the earth, and
 “ the soul” [anima] “ receiving the spirit from God :

* Prophetæ—prædicaverunt ejus secundum carnem adventum, per quem commixtio et communio Dei et Hominis, facta est. Lib. IV. cap. xxxvii. p. 331. Hist. Op. ib.

“ the word of God, therefore, entirely collecting
 “ his own work into himself, was made this,” [the
 Christ] “ and upon this account he confesses him-
 “ self to be the Son of Man *.”

The next passage, which the Doctor adduces, is
 also from Irenæus, who says, that “ he remained
 “ three days where the dead are; and upon this ac-
 “ count the Lord descended into those places, which
 “ are under the earth, preaching also to them his com-
 “ ing, being the forgiveness of sins to them, who be-
 “ lieve on him †.” Upon this passage the Doctor
 says, ‘ He’ [Irenæus] ‘ speaks of Christ as being
 ‘ three days in the place where the dead are preach-
 ‘ ing to the *souls* there,’ [Irenæus says nothing of

* Si hoc non factus est quod nos eramus, non magnum faciebat quod
 passus est et sustinuit. Nos autem, quoniam corpus sumus de terra accep-
 tum, et anima accipiens a Deo Spiritum, omnis quicumque confitebitur.
 Hoc itaque factum est verbum Dei, suum plasma in semetipsum recapitu-
 lans, et propter hoc filium hominis se confitetur. Lib. III. c. xxxiii.
 p. 260, Hist. Op. V. II. p. 204.

† Tribus Diebus conversatus est ubi erant mortui.—Et propter hoc
 Dominum in ea quæ sunt sub terra descendisse, evangelizantem et illis
 adventum suum remissum peccatorum existentem his qui credunt in eum.
 Lib. V. c. xxxv. p. 451. Lib. IV. c. xlv. p. 346. Hist. Op. v. II.
 p. 204.

souls ;

souls; he says, ‘to them,’ namely, the dead] ‘and
 ‘ he could not think that such a *logos* as he de-
 ‘ scribes could have been particularly in that place.
 ‘ For he considered the *logos* not as any thing that
 ‘ was *created*, but what had always existed with
 ‘ God. “Thou, O man, says he, art not uncreated,
 “ nor didst thou” [always] “co-exist with God,
 “ like” [as] “his own word *.” He goes on, ‘In
 “ answer to the Gnostics, who said that it was Jesus
 ‘ only, and not *the Christ* who suffered, he says, indeed,
 ‘ that in the account of our Saviour’s sufferings in the
 “ scriptures, the word *Christ* is made use of †. But
 when he explains himself more fully, he says it was
the man only who suffered, the *logos* being quiescent
 at that time. “As he was a man, that he might be

* Non enim infectus est, O Homo, nec semper co-existebas Deo, sicut proprium ejus verbum. Lib. II. c. xliii. p. 169. Hist. Op. ii. 205. Dr. Priestley has not translated *semper* always: I think also that *sicut* means *as*, and not *like*, as he renders it; and in both instances renders the passage agreeably to his own hypothesis.

* Παύλας ἐπὶ ταῖς πάλαις τοῖς κυρίοις ἡμῶν καὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος αὐτοῦ τῷ
 τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ χρηλαὶ ὀνομασίᾳ. He every where makes use of the name of
 Christ in speaking of the passion of our Lord, and of his humanity. Lib. III.
 c. xx. p. 246. Hist. Op. ib.

“ tempted

“ tempted, so he was the Logos that he might be glorified; the Logos being quiescent in his temptation, crucifixion, and death, but being present with the man in his victory, patience, kindness, resurrection, and ascension *.”

‘ It is sufficiently evident that Novatian [Novatus] believed Christ to have a *soul*, as well as the Logos; this being God, a principle properly *divine*, which could *not* suffer or *die*. “ If the immortal soul” [anima] in other persons, he says, could not be killed, how much less could the Word of God, and God in Christ be killed?—From this, he says, may be inferred, that it was only the Man in Christ that was killed, and that the Word could not become mortal †.” ‘ As he had just before observed, that in man the body only can die, ‘ he

* Ωςπερ γαρ ἡ ἀνθρώπου ἰνα πειρασθῇ, εἴω καὶ λόγος ἡ αἰδοξασθῇ τοῦ χαζούτος μὲν τῷ λόγῳ ἐν τῷ πειρασθῇ, καὶ ταῦρα εἶναι, καὶ ἀποθνήσκειν· συγγινόμενα δὲ ἐν τῷ νικᾶν, καὶ ὑπομένειν, καὶ χρῆσθαι, καὶ ἀνίστασθαι, καὶ ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι. Lib. III. c. xxi. p. 290. Hist. Op. vol. ii. p. 205.

† Quod si anima immortalis occidi aut interfici non potest in quovis alio licet (cum scilicet) corpus et caro sola possit interfici, quanto magis utique verbum Dei, et Deus in Christo, interfici omnino non potuit; cum caro

‘ he would naturally have used the term *body* with
 ‘ respect to Christ, and not of that of *man in him*,
 ‘ if he had not believed, that besides the *Logos*,
 ‘ Christ consisted of a *complete* man, soul and
 ‘ body.’

Let Novatus’s notions of a complete man be what they would, his language is express, that except the *body* or *flesh*, no other part of a man died, not even the *anima*, or sensitive soul; and therefore saying, that Christ consisted of a *complete man*, soul and body, is not only saying *more* than Novatus says (for in him I find *no* term equivalent to *complete*); but also, even if he had said so, it by no means followed, that the *complete man* died, consisting of the intelligent soul, or *animus*, and body, since he even affirms, that the sensitive soul, the immortal *anima*, did *not* die.

sola et corpus occisum sit.—Per hæc colligitur non nisi hominem in Christo interfectum appareat, ad mortalitatem sermonem in loco (in illo) non esse deductum. “ But if the immortal soul [*anima*] cannot be killed or slain in any other person whatever, since the body and flesh alone can be slain; how much more is it evident that the Word of God, and God in Christ, cannot at all be slain, since flesh alone and body can be slain: from this it is collected, that the man in Christ was only slain, and that the word in him was not subjected to mortality.” C. XXV. p. 194. Ed. Jackson, *Hist. Opinions*, V. II. p. 206.

This

This passage also explains what Irenæus intended by the Spirit, V. p. 167, n. 1, that it was nothing else but the Word of God, and shews also that the notions of these two orthodox Fathers, respecting the component parts of Christ, were the same, namely, body; Logos, or Spirit, or the Word of God; and psyche or anima. It may be thought singular that the Doctor should adduce so many passages to prove that the Fathers held the notion that there was an intelligent soul, or a nous, or an animus, in Christ, and yet the term nous, or animus, are not to be met with in any one of the passages hitherto adduced—but to proceed:

The Doctor says, “Tertullian always supposes
 “the same, speaking of Christ’s saying, ‘My God,
 “my God, why hast thou forsaken me:’ this voice
 “was from the *flesh*, and the *soul*, [anima] that
 “is, [of] the Man, not of the Word; nor Spirit,
 “that is, not of God: therefore it was uttered to
 “show that God was impassible, who thus left the
 “Son, whilst he delivered his Man to death*.”

“In

* Sed hæc vox carnis & animæ, id est hominis: non sermonis; nec

“ In Christ,” he says, writing against the Gnostics, “ we truly find a soul” [anima] “ and flesh, declared “ in plain and simple terms : that is the soul, [anima] [is called] soul, [anima]; and the flesh [is called] flesh : but no where is the soul called “ flesh, or the flesh soul, when they should have “ been so called *,” &c.

The Doctor goes on—‘ Origen, who has been supposed to be a favourer of Arianism,’ [Arianism was however unknown for half a century after Origen] ‘ exactly follows these writers in this doctrine. I ‘ shall select a few passages from him. “ Moreover “ let these accusers know, that he whom we think “ and are persuaded to have been God, and the Son “ of God, from the beginning, is the Very-Word, “ and the Very-Wisdom, and the Very-Truth. And

spiritus, id est non Dei, propterea emissus est, ut impassibilem Deum ostenderit, qui sic filium dereliquit, dum hominem ejus tradidit in mortem. ad. Praxeam Sect. xxx. p. 518. Hist. Op. V. ii. p. 207.

* In Christo vero invenimus animam & carnem, simplicibus et nudis vocabulis editas; id est animam animam, carnem, carnem; nusquam animam carnem, aut carnem animam: quando ita nominari debuissent De carne Christi, Sect. xv. p. 318. Hist. Op. ib. I have kept somewhat closer to the original in the rendering these two passages than the Doctor; but there is no mention of an *intelligent* soul in them.

“ we

“ we say that his mortal body, and human soul,
 [Psyche] partook of the greatest not only by com-
 “ munication, but also by union and mixture,
 “ and by having of his divinity communicated to
 “ them, were changed into Deity*. His [Christ’s]
 “ soul [Psyche] being freed of body, preached to
 “ the souls freed of bodies, converting unto him those
 “ of them that were willing †.” In answer to Cel-
 sus, he says, “ If the immortal God Word seems to
 “ Celsus, by taking a mortal body and human soul,”
 [Psyche] “ to be subject to change; let him learn,
 “ that the Word, continuing Word in essence, suf-
 “ fers nothing of what the body or soul suffers ‡. In
 his

* Ομως δε ισωσαν οι εγκαληνες, οτι ον μεν νομιζομεν κη πεπεισμεθα
 αρχηθεν ειναι θεον κη υιον θεου, αυλος ο αυτολογος εστι κη η αυλοσοφια κη
 η αυλοαληθεια. Το δε θνητον αυτου σωμα, κη την ανθρωπινην εν αυτω
 ψυχην. τη προς εκεινο ε μονον κοινωνια, αλλα κη ενωσει κη ανακρασει
 τα μεγαλα φαιμεν προσειληφεναι, κη της εκεινου θειοτης κεκοινωνηκοια, εις
 θεον μεταβεβηκεναι. Cont. Celsum, l. iii. p. 136. Hist. Op. v. 2. p. 208.

† Και γυμνη σωματος γενομενος ψοχη, ταις γυμναις σωματων ωμι-
 λει ψυχαις, επισρεφων κακεινων τας βωλομενας προς αυτον. L. 2. p. 85.
 Hist. Op. ib.

‡ Ει δε και σωμα θνητον κη ψυχην ανθρωπινην αναλαβων ο αθανατος
 θεος λογος δοκει τω Κεγσω αλλαττεσθαι κη μεταπλαττεσθαι • μανθανει ο
 αυτου

“ his commentaries on Matthew, he says, that
 “ Christ increased in wisdom with respect to his hu-
 “ man soul*.” The term Nous, equivalent to the
 human intelligent soul, not being in any of these pas-
 sages, but the word Psyche being so repeatedly men-
 tioned in them, which only means the sensitive carnal
 soul, we may be assured that Origen knew of no
 other soul but this, as a component part of Jesus
 Christ.

Dr. Priestley proceeds, ‘ Socrates, the historian,
 ‘ giving an account of a synod held at Alexandria,
 ‘ at which Athanasius attended, says, “ And they
 “ determined, that while Christ was conversant on
 “ earth, he was not only incarnate, but had also a
 “ soul [Psyche], and it also *seems to have been*
 “ the opinion [the Doctor says, ‘ *which was the opi-*
 ‘ nion,’ which Socrates’s words do not justify] of
 “ the ancient ecclesiastical men: for they did not
 “ imagine that they were introducing any new doc-

ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῇ ὁσίᾳ μένων λόγος ἔδεν μέν πασχεῖ ὡς πασχεῖ τὸ σῶμα καὶ
 καὶ ψυχῇ. L. iv. p. 170. Hist. Op. v. ii. p. 209.

* Καὶ εἶπε γὰρ ἀπερὶ τοῦ σωτήρος ἀναλαβάντος ἀνθρώπινην ψυχὴν
 καὶ Ἰησοῦς παρεκοπτεν. V. i. p. 330. Hist. Op. ib.

“ trine

“ trine into the church, but what ecclesiastical tra-
 “ dition from the beginning had declared, and was
 “ demonstrably explained by learned Christians; for
 “ all the ancients who have treated upon the Logos,
 “ in this respect, have left it thus written. There-
 “ fore Irenæus and Clemens, Apollinarius of Jerusa-
 “ lem, and Serapion, who presided over the church
 “ of Antioch, acknowledge in their works, that
 “ Christ, while on earth, had a human soul.” [Psyche]
 “ Moreover, the synod convened on account of Be-
 “ ryllus, bishop of Philadelphia in Arabia, writ-
 “ ing to Beryllus, delivered the same things; and
 “ Origen, every where in his writings, acknowledges
 “ Jesus while on earth to have had a human soul*.”
 [Psyche]

The

* Και τον ενανθρωπησαντα, ε μονον ενσαρκον, αλλα κ' επιφυχομενον
 απεφηναντο, η κ' παλαι τοις εκκλησιαστικοις ανδρασι εδοκει. ε γαρ
 νεαραν τινα θρησκειαν επινοησαντες εις την εκκλησιαν εισηγαγον, αλλα
 απερ εξ αρχης κ' η εκκλησιαστικη παραδοσις ελεγε, κ' αποδεικτικως
 παρα τοις χριστιανων σοφοις επιλοσοφειτο. ετο γαρ παντες οι παλαιστε-
 ροι περι ιηου λογον γυμνασαντες, εγγραφον ημιν κατελιπον. Και γαρ
 Ειρηκαιος τε κ' Κλημης. Απολλιναριος τε ο Ιεραπολιτης, κ' Σαραπτιων
 ο της εν Αλριοχεια πραιτης εκκλησιας, επιφυχον τον ενανθρωπησαντα,

The Doctor goes on—‘Indeed, as I have observed, ‘ had some of the Fathers had *one* opinion on this subject, and some another, it could not have failed to ‘ occasion a *discussion* of the point, and warm controversy, before the time of Arius.’ [To this I entirely agree, and it is a strong argument that they had only one opinion upon the point, and that opinion was, that Christ had but a *sensitive* carnal soul, without an intelligent one] ‘It is to this day also the *received* ‘ *opinion of all* those who are called Orthodox, that ‘ Christ has a proper human soul, and that the Arians ‘ still are the *only* Christians who deny this.’ [The Doctor is the last man in the world who should mention this circumstance.]

‘As this doctrine, of Christ having a proper human soul, together with that of the real origin and ‘ nature of the Logos, is of so much consequence to ‘ the system of Arianism, I have carefully attended ‘ to every thing which I could find to have been ad-

εν τοις πονηθεῖσιν αὐτοῖς λόγοις ὡς ὁμολογούμενον αὐτοῖς φασκεῖν ἔ-
μεν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ διὰ Βηρυλλοῦ τὸν φιλαδελφίας τῆς ἐν Ἀραβίᾳ ἐπισκο-
ποῦ γενομένη συνοδος, γράψασα Βηρυλλῷ τὰ αὐτὰ παραδεδωκεν. Ωρι-
γενῆς δὲ πάντα καὶ μὲν ἐν τοῖς φερομένοις αὐτῇ βιβλίοις, ἐμφύχον τοῦ
ἐκπεφρωπησάντα οἶδεν. L. 3. c. 7. p. 178. Hist. Op. v. ii. p. 210.

‘vanced

vanced by any Arians upon the subject; but to my
 great surprize, I have hardly found that it has been
 so much as noticed by them, except by Mr. Whis-
 ton, who, in his *Collection of Ancient Monuments re-*
lating to the Trinity, without mentioning any other
 authority whatever, infers, from their being no *ex-*
press mention of a human soul in Christ in two par-
 ticular treatises of Athanasius; viz. that *against the*
Gentiles, and that *on the Incarnation*, that “this Fa-
 ther *seems* as if he had never heard of such a notion
 among Christians at all.” p. 74. He adds, “I so-
 lemnly appeal to the unbiaſſed reader, after he has
 carefully perused the whole discourse, whether he
 can believe that Athanasius owned a *human rational*
soul, as assumed by the Word at the incarnation,
 when he wrote that treatise.” He then concludes
 with *asserting*, that “the acknowledgment of a *hu-*
man and a rational soul in Christ, distinguished from
 his divine nature, was one of the last branches of
 the Athanasian heresy.” [This position I *believe* to
 be true; but without express testimony, much more
 upon a negative argument, he was blameable for as-
 serting it. However probable in itself, nothing should

be *asserted* without express testimony of a well-informed writer.]

‘ That this writer,’ ‘ the Doctor goes on,’ ‘ was aware of the importance of this subject is very evident.’ “ It is indisputable,” he says, “ and is agreed on by all, that in case our Saviour did *not* assume a human rational soul at his incarnation, the common orthodoxy cannot be defended :” ‘ but if he *did*, the Arian hypothesis must fall to the ground.’ [But *if* he did not, and I trust that every reader must be convinced that the Doctor has not produced *one* passage from the antients, which *expressly* affirms that *he did*, then the Arian hypothesis *may* still be maintained upon this ground. Being aware, as well as Whiston, of the importance of this fact, that Christ was by the Orthodox supposed to have had only a *sensitive* soul, till *after* the Arian controversy, and which all the passages adduced by the Doctor show, for of no *other* soul do they speak ; it will of course follow, that the Orthodox notions on this head, being *novel*, cannot be supported. The reader will also please to recollect, that the soul, which Socrates has said, p. 175, n. that was established by the council of Alexandria in the year 372, was
only

only a *sensitive* soul, *Psyche*, so that an *intelligent* soul was unknown to the Orthodox for nearly *half* a century after the council of Nice.

The Doctor, after going on for eight pages with hypothetical reasonings, and adducing passages from the Fathers, which prove nothing, as having no mention at all of any *sort* of soul in them, and which I trust my reader will excuse me from transcribing, goes on thus: ‘ Upon the whole, I cannot help thinking, that there is the *strongest evidence* that the *Antinicens* Fathers believed that Christ had a *proper human soul*, as well as a *proper human body*; [this is a very extraordinary assertion; for the last (a human body), we have the *most express evidence*: for the former, we have *none at all*, unless *Anima*, and *Psyche*, mean the *intelligent* soul, but of which I have as yet seen *no proof*] ‘ their Logos being such as could not ‘ supply the place of it,’ [Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Novatus, thought differently, who lived *before* the Arian controversy; Cassian, and others *after* it, thought in like manner, as the Doctor himself observes, p. 218] ‘ being that *power* which, at the ‘ very time it was incarnate, supported all things, and

‘ was even then as much in the Father as ever it had
 ‘ been ; [I beg leave to know, if Novatus and Origen,
 who in their times were accounted orthodox, could
 hold this *notion* ; the former of whom said that the
 Sabellians extended his honours too much, V. Pre.
 Disq. p. 47. n. 23. the latter, that he ought not to
 be worshipped, V. Pre. Disq. p. 46, n. 22] ‘ con-
 ‘ sequently these Fathers could not have been
 Arians.’

‘ That the soul, which the Fathers ascribed to
 ‘ Christ, beside the Logos, was a *proper human soul*,
 ‘ and not merely the *sensitive soul* of some philosophers,
 ‘ is *evident* from *the man* being said by them to consist
 ‘ of this *soul* and *body* ;’ [I could wish that the Doc-
 tor had given some of these passages] ‘ a *kind* of defi-
 ‘ nition in which the term *soul* always expressed
 ‘ every thing belonging to a man that was not body.
 ‘ This will have been observed to be the case with
 ‘ respect to Irenæus.’ [The passage from Irenæus
 speaks only of the *anima* ; and as in it he is only
 speaking of the composition of Christ, what may ap-
 ply to *him* is not conclusive with regard to *other*
 men.

‘ Those

‘ Those philosophers, who, following the principles of Plato, maintained that man has *two souls*, ‘ gave Christ two souls also,’ [not however for a considerable space after the rise of the Arian controversy] ‘ and disposed of them according to their respective natures. “ Christ, said Theophylact, was in paradise, not only as God, but also he took with him “ his, *human, rational, and intelligent soul* ;” [Nous] “ and “ descended into hell with the sensitive soul * ” [Psyche]. This proves that they were the sensitive souls that Christ went to preach to in hell, V. p. 167, n. 2, and it also shews that the Psychais of Origen, V. p. 173, n. 2, were the sensitive souls only : and consequently that the Doctor’s friend, X. Hist. Op. vol. iv. p. 358, was wrong, in supposing that they were the *intelligent* souls which were intended by that term. The reader may also perceive with what propriety of language Theophylact expresses

* Και γαρ ε μονον καθο θεος ην εν τω παραδεισω, αλλο κ̃ καθο ανθρωπινην ψυχην προσελαβελο λογικην κ̃ νοεραν, κ̃ εν τω παραδεισω γεγνε μελα τε νοος, κ̃ εις αδ̃α κατηλθε μελα ψυχης. In Luc. c. 23, Opera, v. i. p. 535. Hist. Op. v. ii. p. 221.

himself;

himself: he has the *Pfyché* following the *Nous*, and carefully *distinguished* from it. How then happens it, that not *one* of the Ante-nicene Fathers expresses himself so properly and guardedly.' That many of them were his superiors in knowledge and ability, I apprehend will not be disputed. It can then be only accounted for, that in the *Ante-nicene* age, the doctrine of the *two* souls in Christ was *unknown*, but in the time of Theophylact, who flourished in the 11th century, it was an *established* opinion. This inference, I apprehend, is much strengthened by the following passage from Fulgentius, who flourished in the beginning of the sixth century, about a century and a half after the time when I suppose the doctrine of the *two* souls was established. His words are, " For which reason that this error of the soul
 " and body may be at once understood—if the Son
 " of God only received the flesh of man, *without*
 " the rational soul [*anima rationalis*], he brought
 " home the *inferior* part of the sheep, but left the
 " *better* part (which God forbid) in everlasting error ;
 " for it is manifest that he brought back that which
 " he carried upon his own shoulders : but if he pro-
 " fesses

“ fesses that he carried back the *entire* sheep, the
 “ *whole* man must be acknowledged in Christ: there-
 “ fore the redemption of man is to be then believed,
 “ if there was no deficiency of the human assump-
 “ tion, i. e. of the brought back sheep in the Son of
 “ God*.” We find the *anima* here *qualified* by
 the *rationalis*: his doing this, and its being ne-
 glected by *all* the *Ante-nicene* fathers, can surely be
 owing to no other cause, except the *different* modes
 of faith held by the *Ante-nicene* and *Post-nicene*
 Fathers.

The Doctor observes himself how guarded the
 primitive writers were in expressing themselves in
 other respects. Is it not then very singular, that
 they should have *uniformly*, and *without exception*,
 expressed themselves improperly, when speaking of

* Quapropter cum error iste animæ simul intelligatur, et corporis, si
 Dei Filius absque anima rationali solam accepit hominis carnem, infe-
 riorem partem illius ovis domum retulit, meliorem vero (quod absit) er-
 rori perpetuo dereliquit: nam manifestum est, quoniam hoc revocavit,
 quod propriis humeris reportavit: si autem ipse totam se profitetur
 ovem propriis humeris impositam reportasse, totus homo cognoscatur in
 Christo: quoniam tunc est hominis credenda redemptio: si in filio sus-
 ceptionis humanæ, id est, ovis illius reportatæ, non deficit plenitudo. Ad
 Trasmundum, lib. i. c. x. p. 451. Hist. Opin. V. iv. p. 228.

the soul of Christ, which they must have done, had they held, that he had both an *intelligent* and a sensitive soul. All the Fathers admit, that the Arians held † that the Christ took body only ; and that their denial of the *Psyche*, and not of the *Nous*, that is, of the *sensitive*, and not of the *intelligent* soul, was their error in this respect, manifestly appears from this passage from the annals of Glycus : “ The Arians say, that the flesh of the Lord “ was without *Psyche*, or the living principle*.” “ Surely no ingenuity can arrest these words to imply that they denied the intelligent principle, or *Nous*.

The Doctor appears to me to have expressed himself far more agreeably to fact in his corruptions of Christianity. When speaking of the Arian heresy, he says, Vol. I. p. 105, ‘ There seems to have been no ‘ reason why Christ should have been supposed to ‘ have had any more than *one* intelligent principle ; ‘ and yet we have seen that some of the Ante- ‘ nicene Fathers(1) thought that there was in Christ a ‘ proper *human soul*, besides the *Logos*, which con- ‘ stituted his divinity. But perhaps they might

* Των Αρειανων λεγοντων αψυχον ειναι την τε κυριε σαρκα. Pt. III. p. 244. Hist. Opin. Vol. IV. p. 194.

† But that Arius himself acknowledged the *Psyche*.

(1) This I deny.

* have

' have been reconciled to this opinion by the popular
 ' notion of dæmons possessing men, who yet had
 ' souls of their own ;' [This mode of reconciling, as we
 have *no* proof that they made use of it, should be *little*
 regarded] ' or by anima, which is the word which Tertul-
 ' lian [and all the Latin Fathers] uses, [and Psyche, its
 equivalent, which all the Greek Fathers use] ' they
 ' might mean the *sensitive principle* in men, as distinct
 ' from the animus, or *rational principle*; a distinction
 ' which we find made by Cicero, and others.' It is
 singular, that this rational sentiment was not adhered
 to, instead of adopting another against the *express testimony*
 of all the Fathers ; for that the Fathers speak only of the
sensitive principle in man in all those passages, which the
 Doctor has adduced to prove the contrary, must be admit-
 ted, 'till it can be clearly shewn, by the most *express*
testimony, that is, by a passage in which the terms *Anima*
 or *Psyche* will admit of no other meaning than the *in-*
telligent principle : and even in that case the question
 will remain undecided, as there is *express testimony*
 for the opposite opinion : but till such a passage is pro-

duced, it must be admitted, that the Doctor has taken up an opinion against the express testimony of history.

The Doctor says, Corruptions of Christianity, Vol. I. p. 107, ‘ Whiston, who was certainly well
 ‘ read in Christian antiquity, *asserts**, that Athanasius
 ‘ *seems* never to have heard of the opinion of Christ
 ‘ having any other soul than his divinity, and that
 ‘ the idea of a human and rational soul in Christ was
 ‘ one of the last branches of this heresy. This writer
 ‘ also *asserts*, that there does not appear, in Athanasius’s
 ‘ Treatise on the Incarnation, the least sign of the
 ‘ hypostatical union, or communication of proper-
 ‘ ties†, which, he says, the Orthodox have been since
 ‘ forced to devise in support of their notions. This
 ‘ business, however, was finally settled on the occa-

* The Doctor here refers to Whiston’s Collection of Records, p. 74. and 75. I have examined this work, but could find no such passage.

† The hypostatical union was very different from a communication of properties, as will clearly appear in the second part.

‘ sion of what was called the heresy of Nestorius, Bishop
 ‘ of Constantinople, which has had great consequen-
 ‘ ces, the effects of it remaining to this day’ : I shall
 hereafter consider what the Doctor has said concerning
 this heresy.

To what I have already observed concerning Mr.
 Badcock, I shall now add the following obser-
 vations; beginning with what he has said upon the so-
 much contested passage of Jerome. As this passage
 was the *strong reason*, which inclined him to think
 that the Nazarenes and Ebionites differed *consider-
 ably* in the articles of their belief, the enquiry be-
 comes more important to see if it be well founded.
 To enable the unlearned reader to form a sure opi-
 nion upon the question, I shall first lay before him
 the original words of Jerome, then Mr. Badcock’s
 translation, putting in Italics those words of *his* for
 which there is *nothing* equivalent in the original; af-
 terwards a literal translation, with further remarks
 upon Mr. Badcock’s. Jerome says, Quid dicam de
 Hebionitis qui Christianos esse se simulant? Usque
 hodie per totas orientis synagogas inter Judæos hæ-
 refis

resis est, quæ dicitur Mineorum, et a Phariseis nunc usque damnatur, quos vulgo Nazaræos nuncupant, qui credunt in Christum filium Dei natum de Virgine Maria, et eum dicunt qui sub Pontio Pilato passus est, et resurrexit, in quem et nos credimus. Thus rendered by Mr. Badcock: “ *But why should I speak* “ of the Ebionites who have only the semblance of “ Christians? *For* even to this very day, through all “ the synagogues of the East, *there* is a sect among “ the Jews called the Minei (condemned even now by “ the Pharisees), which *sect* they *more* generally call by “ *the name* of Nazarenes, who believe in Christ the “ Son of God; and they profess that he was born “ of the Virgin, suffered under Pontius Pilate, and “ rose again; in whom also we believe.” Monthly Review, vol. lxix. p. 217. This passage, I apprehend, may be more literally rendered thus: “ What shall I “ say of the Ebionites, who feign themselves to be “ Christians? Even to this day through all the syna- “ gogues of the East, among the Jews, (it) is “ a heresy which is called of the Minei, and by the “ Pharisees is even now condemned, whom they” (Pharisees) “ vulgarly call Nazarenes, who believe in “ Christ

“ Christ, the Son of God, born of the Virgin Ma-
 “ ry; and they say that it was he who suffered un-
 “ der Pontius Pilate, and rose again: in whom also
 “ we believe.” The differences in the translations
 are very obvious. Mr. Badcock translates *quid*, *why*,
 which it *never* signifies, instead of into *what*, which
 here it can *only* signify, *dicam* ‘*should I speak,*’ in the
potential mood, whereas it is plainly the *indicative* mood;
 but this mode of translating favoured *his* supposition.
 There are *no* words in the original to answer ‘*for,*’ and
 ‘*there;*’ he translates *hæresis*, ‘*sect,*’ a harmless term,
 but heresy had long ceased to be a harmless expression;
 however, it favoured *his* notion, that there was a
 considerable difference *between* the Nazarenes and
 Ebionites, whom Jerome brands with heresy, in the
 articles of their respective creeds. He renders *quæ*
dicitur Mineorum, ‘*called the Minei,*’ omitting the
 important ‘*quæ,*’ which refers to the preceding mem-
 ber of the sentence, and making *dicitur* as if it were
 the *active past participle*, instead of the *indicative mood*
passive. By omitting to translate the *et*, which con-
 nects what follows with what preceded, he has *con-*
trived to get the member ‘*a Phariseis nunc usque*

‘*damnatur*,’ into a parenthesis, as if totally immaterial upon the point in question; and translates *damnatur*, in like manner *participially*, as he had before done *dicitur*. He translates *quos*, ‘which sect!’ *vulgo*, ‘more generally!’ In what dictionary is this meaning assigned to *vulgo*? *More generally* implies *exceptions*, whereas the original implies *none*: being, ‘whom they vulgarly call,’ or rather nickname ‘Nazarenes,’ agreeably to what has been observed in the Pre. Disq. p. 27, on the Acts of the Apostles, and Tertullian. Mr. Badcock goes on, ‘and they *profess* that he was born of the Virgin.’ This is more than Jerome says, for he only makes them *believers* in the miraculous conception; ‘and ‘that they *professed* [if *dicunt* will be allowed to be properly rendered *profess*], he suffered,’ &c. I now appeal to the reader, whether Mr. Badcock’s translation, which deviates so widely from the original, be not so ‘managed*,’ as to favour very much his own supposition; for, from the manner in which he has translated the passage, it would appear, that hæresis referred not *at all* to the Nazarenes, and then

* This phraseology is applied by him to some of Dr. Priestley’s translations.

Jerome would completely distinguish the Nazarenes from the Ebionites, which it would be justly concluded he would not have done, did they not materially differ in their creeds.

I will now lay before the reader the words of Jerome, which immediately precede those already quoted; as it may be, that they will tend to elucidate what follows, and moreover prove 'management' in Mr. Badcock. Jerome says, Si hoc verum est; et Cerinthi et Ebionis hæresim dilabimur, qui credentes in Christo, propter hoc solum a patribus anathematizati sunt, quod legis ceremonias Christi Evangelio miscuerunt, & sic nova confessi sunt, ut vetera non amitterent. Quid dicam, &c. " If this is true, we are gliding
 " into the heresy of Cerinthus and Ebion, who believ-
 " ing in Christ, on this account *only* were excommu-
 " nicated by the Fathers, *because* THEY mixed the ce-
 " remonies of the law with the gospel of Christ, and
 " so confessed the new, as not to loose the old" [Promises]. Were Mr. Badcock now living, I would ask him, how happens it, that the term *hæresis* in this passage should mean *heresy*, but in the passage immediately following, and connected with it, that it should

should intend only *sect*. That it signifies heresy in the first passage, *all* the moderns admit, who have been however ingenious enough to discover that Cerinthus was a Gnostic, and consequently a heretic, but whom I affirm (did such a person ever exist) to have been an Ebionite, and I think that the present passage is no *small* argument in favour of this opinion, if express testimony be admitted; the same sentiment being ascribed both to him and to Ebion, respecting Jesus, and the obligation of the Jewish law. But Mr. Badcock, in translating the second *hæresis* 'sect,' was influenced by the notion held by Bishop Horsley, and many of the Orthodox, that the Nazarenes were not heretics: however, that they were equally so as the Ebionites, I believe the unprejudiced will conclude from this passage. I would also ask him, what was the *other* name of the Nazarenes, seeing that Nazarene was only a *nick-name*, a vulgar appellation? I think the question may be also proposed to Bishop Horsley.

Mr. Badcock, Monthly Review, Vol. LXX. p. 68, cites a long passage from Jerome, too long to be inserted here, more particularly as it is not accompanied

panied with the original, but is only the *scope* and *intent*, as he thinks, of Jerome's argument, in which Jerome clearly *distinguishes* the Nazarenes from the Ebionites; but as he, Mr. Badcock, ascribes no other opinions to these Nazarenes than what Origen had before assigned to the Ebionites, I shall certainly not pin my faith upon his commentary or explication of Jerome. His extraordinary mode of rendering the passage just adduced from Jerome, should put all readers upon their guard against receiving *his* comments.

He says, p. 69, ' We have only one remark to
' add to the foregoing reflections on this subject, and
' we think that if a *single* doubt remains, it will ef-
' fectually remove it.

' That Austin considered the Nazarenes and Ebion-
' ites as *different* sects in regard to matters of faith
' (however otherwise allied), not only appears from
' the different accounts he gives of each in his little
' treatise on heresies, but from his letter in reply to
' Jerome. This may be demonstrated from the fol-
' lowing expression: Hoc si ita est, non jam in hære-
' sim Ebionis, VEL eorum quos vulgo Nazaræos nun-
' cupant,

‘ cupant, VEL quamlibet veterem, sed nescio in quam
 ‘ novam dilabimur *.’ This passage, I affirm, so far
 from proving that the Nazarenes and Ebionites were
different sects, shews that they were the *same*; for
 the ‘ eorum, of them’ here being a *relative*, must re-
 fer to something which *preceded*, that is of Ebion, or
 rather of his followers; and its being put in the plural
 number, is no objection; for he could not say ‘ ejus
 of him,’ who *are* called *Nazarenes*. It also appears
 from this passage, that the Nazarenes had a *gen-
 teeler* appellation: they who deny it was Ebionites,
 are requested to inform the public what this *other*
 appellation was. It may be also thought singular,
 that if Ebionites were *not* their *genteeler* appellation,
 they should be *always* distinguished by their *nick-name*,
 without the other being *ever* hinted at.

Moreover Mr. Badcock, by printing the *vels* in the
 just-cited passage from Augustine in *large* characters, no
 doubt intended to impose on the careless reader by *sound*.
 But let the sentence be perfected, and the *management*
 here will be obvious. Hoc si ita est, non jam in

* “ If this is so, we are not gliding into the heresy of Ebion, or of
 “ them whom they vulgarly call Nazarenes, or into some old heresy,
 “ but into what new one I know not.”

hæresim Ebionis, VEL eorum [Ebionitarum] quos vulgo Nazaræos nuncupant, VEL quamlibet veterem, sed nescio in quam novam dilabimur. If this “ be so, we are *not* gliding into the heresy of Ebion, “ OR of them” [Ebionites] “ whom they [Pharisees] “ vulgarly call Nazarenes, OR into some old heresy, “ but I know not into what new one.” I say that *eorum* must refer to the Ebionites, for no other heretics are mentioned in this letter of Augustine: moreover, what other hereticks, except the Ebionites, were nick-named, or vulgarly called by the Pharisees Nazarenes. See p. 192. And that *vel* does not introduce a new subject, as Mr. Badcock here supposes, will be evident from a long quotation from Jerome, which I shall have occasion just now to introduce: but, in the mean time, the following passage from Cicero, which is cited by Calepini, as an instance of its primary signification, will show. ‘ Cur non adsum *vel* spectator laudum tuarum, *vel* princeps, *vel* socius, *vel* minister consiliorum.’ Fam. iii. Ep. 7. I therefore repeat, that to no other cause but *art* and *management* can be attributed the printing the *vels* in large characters, in order to entrap the inattentive and unlearned readers.

Mr.

Mr. Badcock is also witty upon Dr. Priestley for translating *Quid dicam de Hebionitis, qui Christianos esse se simulant? usque hodie per totas orientis synagogas inter Judæos hæresis est.* ‘What shall I say of the Hebionites, who feign themselves to be Christians? even to this day *it* is a heresy among the Jews throughout all the synagogues of the east.’ He asks what *it* refers to, according to this rendering: to which he answers, the *Ebionites*, that is, the Ebionites *is!* This may be witty, and may be conclusive, with persons who put up with empty *sound*: but *it* does *not* refer to the *Ebionites*, but to the *opinion* of Cerinthus and Ebion: which opinion is, he says, even to this very day, a heresy throughout all the synagogues of the Jews in the east. Mr. Badcock translates *est* ‘*there is*’ which is absurd; for in this case the *name* of the heretics is not given, but their *nick-name*: and Augustine, in alluding to this passage of Jerome, says, ‘If this be so, we are not gliding,’ &c. where he makes *it* plainly refer to the *opinion* of the Ebionites. See the original, former paragraph, in which he also *only* notices the Nazarenes by their nick-name, if they were not followers of Ebion.

I am now inclined to give his commentary or explanation

cation of Jerome; because, I apprehend, that were it well founded, he would not have resorted to the very lame proof just cited from Augustine. According to Mr. Badcock, Jerome writes to this purpose: ‘ If, ‘ Augustine, it be true, as you assert, that it is law- ‘ ful for Jews, when converted to the Christian re- ‘ ligion, to maintain a connection with the rituals ‘ of the Mosaic law, then it follows, by necessary ‘ consequence, from your position, that the ancient ‘ church fell into an error in excommunicating Ce- ‘ rinthus and Ebion, solely on account of their at- ‘ tachment to these abrogated and useless ceremonies. ‘ But why should I speak of the Ebionites—a people ‘ so very corrupt in faith as they are universally al- ‘ lowed by the Christian church to have been from ‘ the very beginning? For I foresee an objection to ‘ my producing such examples to enforce my argu- ‘ ment against your concession. I foresee, that you ‘ are prepared to say—“ *Hebion! and his followers!*” ‘ Why, they were not excommunicated on account ‘ of their adherence to the old law, but on account ‘ of the heresy of their principles respecting the na- ‘ ture and person of Jesus Christ; for though they

‘ acknowledged Christ to be the *Messiah*, yet, after all
 ‘ by denying his attributes as the Son of God,
 ‘ and begotten by the Holy Ghost on the Virgin
 ‘ Mary, their *profession of Christianity* was but a mere
 ‘ pretence, a piece of hypocritical *simulation*.’ I will
 ‘ grant all this, for argument sake, and therefore wave
 ‘ any advantage from such examples. I will not pro-
 ‘ duce the Ebionites as vouchers, but lodge my appeal
 ‘ with an authority more pertinent and decisive; and in
 ‘ *in every view freed from the objection* which you would,
 ‘ in all probability, urge against the instance I have
 ‘ before produced. I will appeal to the *Nazarenes*,
 ‘ whose faith is *not* liable to those charges of *heretical*
 ‘ pravity which lie against the *Ebionites*: I say the Na-
 ‘ zarenes, who, although they believe that Christ was
 ‘ THE SON OF GOD, and that he was born of
 ‘ the Virgin Mary; though, in short, they believe in
 ‘ the SAME CHRIST *that* we do, and *as* we do; yet
 ‘ notwithstanding this orthodoxy of faith, and agree-
 ‘ ment with us in *all* those points of doctrine that are
 ‘ deemed *essential* to the creed of the Catholic Church—
 ‘ yet, notwithstanding all, they are, and have been,
 ‘ looked upon more in the light of Jews than Chris-
 ‘ tians.

‘ tians. And why? Not, as I have said, on account
 ‘ of their *faith*, but their *practice*; not because they
 ‘ did not believe as Christians, but because they acted
 ‘ like Jews. It is this latter circumstance, and this
 ‘ alone, that creates the distinction: drop this, and
 ‘ they are as we ourselves be. Therefore, the obvious
 ‘ conclusion from this instance is, ‘ *that the most or-*
 ‘ *thodox faith will not entitle a man to the privileges of*
 ‘ *the gospel, if he remains under the bondage of the law.*’

‘ This is, *we think*, the scope and intent of Jerome’s
 ‘ argument. Taken in any other light, particularly
 ‘ Dr. Priestley’s, there is no sense, no consistency, no
 ‘ argument in it.’

Since I transcribed the above paragraphs from Mr. Badcock, I have examined, and carefully perused, the letters which passed between Jerome and Augustine, alluded to by him: and though I had no doubt before the perusal, that Jerome’s letter to Augustine, with regard to its object, was misrepresented by Mr. Badcock, yet I acknowledge, that I had no idea of its having been so very much so as I found it was. The reason why I was confident it was misrepresented, was, that if the *Ebionites* and *Nazarenes*

were so perfectly *contra-distinguished* by Jerome, as Mr. Badcock here represents them to have been, I could not conceive how Bishop Horsley could have missed appealing to this letter to prove a *distinction* between the *Ebionites* and *Nazarenes*, instead of recurring to *presumptions*, which *prove* nothing: and the more so, as the learned Bishop values himself upon his *watchfulness*. To enable the reader to form a complete idea upon the point in question, it is necessary that I should fairly lay before him the origin and progress of a controversy between these two orthodox Fathers of the church: and as it will tend to elucidate the already-cited, and so-much-disputed, passage of Jerome, I acknowledge, that I have the fewer scruples in so doing, even though it should be attended with some degree of tediousness.

Jerome, in his commentary upon the following verses of the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, ch. ii. v. 11, 12, 13, 14. “ But when Peter was come to Antioch, I with-
 “ stood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.
 “ For before that certain came from James, he did
 “ eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come,
 “ he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them
 “ which

“ which were of the circumcision. And the other
 “ Jews dissembled likewise with him ; infomuch that
 “ Barnabas also was carried away by their diffimula-
 “ tion. But when I saw that they walked not up-
 “ rightly, according to the truth of the gospel, I
 “ said unto Peter before [them] all, if thou, being
 “ a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles,
 “ and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the
 “ Gentiles to live as do the Jews ?” writes to this
 effect : That as it was impossible that Peter, who
 had the vision of the vessel, which descended like a
 great sheet from heaven, containing all sorts of ani-
 mals, to show to him that in future nothing which
 God created was unclean, either with regard to liv-
 ing creatures for the food of man, or nations to have
 converse with, could be ignorant of the gospel dis-
 pensation which annihilated the Jewish distinctions
 in both these respects, Jerome, I say, supposes, in re-
 gard of what Paul says, that Peter ‘ walked not up-
 ‘ rightly according to the truth of the gospel,’ as being
 incredible, that it could not literally be true, and there-
 fore, that, in this instance, Paul *dispensed with truth*.
 He also supposes, that it was a scheme devised between

Paul and Peter *, to get rid of the trouble, which the Jewish believers in Jesus gave them, who were perpetually insisting upon the necessity of imposing the ceremonial law of Moses upon the Gentile Christians, and even compelled the Apostles themselves, from fear, to continue its practice, though sinful; but which, in the present circumstances of the church, they were permitted by the Deity to conform to, without incurring guilt. For by Peter's submitting, who was the chief of the Apostles, to be rebuked by Paul on this account (for his discountenancing the Gentiles, who adopted not the Jewish ceremonial law, by absenting himself from their tables, thereby looking upon them as unclean), and thereby acknowledging himself to be wrong—his submitting, I say, to Paul's rebuke for so doing, would be a conclusive argument against the other Jewish believers insisting upon the necessity of the Jewish ceremonial law being imposed upon the Gentile converts; for Peter, who was the chief of the Apostles, acknowledging it to be contrary to the intent of the gospel of Christ, no other Jewish believer could be supposed, after his acknowledgment and sub-

* The holy Father compares them to barristers, who, to deceive their clients, pretend to be angry with, and to abuse each other.

mission, to be well grounded in insisting upon it. Augustine, however, in his letters to Jerome, observes, that if it is once admitted, that the Apostles *lied* upon any account, that the apostolical writings would from thenceforward cease to be a foundation to argue from; for whoever in them would find, he says, any thing contrary to what he thought to be right, or to his passions, had nothing more to do than to assert, that the Apostle therein spoke *not according to truth*, but to serve a *purpose*; and thus, if it be admitted that the Apostles once *lied*, or expressed themselves *contrary* to fact, to serve a purpose, there was an end to the New Testament: which, he says, would be even worse than what the Manichees affirm; namely, that the books of the New Testament were all spurious writings, written by unknown persons, to which, however, the names of those persons were prefixed, who were supposed to have been the followers of Jesus; but who never had the *audacity* to affirm, that the Apostles *lied*. He therefore insists upon it, that Paul wrote the truth, that

‘ Peter walked not uprightly according to the truth of
 ‘ the gospel.’ And to obviate an objection of Jerome, that it would be the height of impertinence in Paul

to

to blame in Peter what he himself frequently transgressed in, namely, the complying with the Jewish ordinances, Augustine presumes, that the Jewish ordinances were permitted to be practised by the *Jews* for some *indefinite* time after the preaching of the gospel; and that therefore Paul did *not* transgress the evangelical rule by practising the ceremonial law, for as yet it had *not* been proscribed; though its uselessness had been frequently insisted upon, and declared by himself. To this Jerome replies, that if Augustine's opinion, respecting the lawfulness of practising the Jewish ceremonial law after the preaching of the gospel, be well-founded, that then the Fathers of the church, who excommunicated Cerinthus and Ebion, were wrong, for that this *alone* was their crime, *the mixing the ceremonial law with Christianity*. This proves, beyond a doubt, what was the error of the Cerinthians and Ebionites in the opinion of Jerome, and that they did not attempt to enforce the ceremonial law of the Jews upon Gentile converts, as the learned Bishop would gladly make us believe; for the opinion here imputed to the Ebionites and Cerinthians, was the same as Jerome, inasmuch as he well could, was indirectly *imputing to Augus-*
tine

tine. This also proves, that it was for their *mixing* the Jewish rituals with Christianity, they were excommunicated, and not for the *Judaic superstition*, as the learned Bishop would make us believe, by a very forced, and, I may say, absurd exposition of the passage cited, Tracts, p. 189. Augustine, however, instead of denying that his opinion was that of the Ebionites, *seems* to acknowledge it, by saying, that if Jerome's opinion was right, that upon the preaching of the gospel, the Jewish ritual law was *instantly* abrogated, and that the practising of it was *sinful*; and yet that the Apostles fraudulently and dissemblingly practised it: That their so doing was far *more* sinful than that of the Ebionites, who, openly and without *fraud*, practised it (as thinking there was no sin in so doing), by superadding dissimulation to their transgression. However, these two holy and *charitable* chiefs of Orthodoxy agree in affirming, that those Jewish or Gentile converts in Jesus, who *then* practised the Jewish rituals, went to the lowest pit of hell *. This I affirm to be the

* Et quicumque eas observaverit, sive ex Judæis sive ex Gentibus, erunt

the substance of what these learned Fathers have asserted, inasmuch as the Ebionites are concerned. I also affirm, that the term *Nazarenes* is only mentioned in the passage already cited, p. 192, and also referred to: though I am confident that no one who read Mr. Badcock's *Scope and Intent* of Jerome's letter, who had not consulted the original, but must have concluded, that the Ebionites and Nazarenes were particularly *contra-distinguished* elsewhere in that letter; or must have concluded, that Mr. Badcock was a gross misrepresenter of facts, which I affirm to be the truth. Sincerely sorry am I, that this very ingenious gentleman, for he truly appears to me to have been such, no longer exists to defend himself from this charge; but his memoirs, and some original letters respecting this controversy, having been lately laid before the public, in that truly respectable miscellany the *Gentleman's Magazine*, the gentleman who supplied those materials, must certainly be capable of defending his departed friend, which will require no

nbarathum diaboli devolutum Jerome. Ed. Par. 1546. tom. 2. fo. iii. D. Quicumque eas observaverit, sive ex Judæis sive ex Gentibus, non solum veraciter, verum etiam simulate, cura in barathum diaboli devolutum. Augustine ib. fo. 118. H.

great skill. It will be most effectually done by giving a translation of Jerome's letter, accompanied with the original, or even that part of it which relates to the point in question. However, be this as it may, Bishop Horsley has only cited the above passage from Jerome's letter, to make good his hypothesis, that, according to Jerome, the Ebionites and Nazarenes were distinct sects; which, I apprehend, will be deemed *prima facie* evidence in my favour, that in this letter there is not a *more conclusive* passage for establishing this notion.

Not having examined Jerome when I made the observations, which I have done upon the Bishop of St. David's Tracts, I paid but little attention to what his Lordship had said to make good his position, that the Nazarenes and Ebionites were *different* sects; because, as founded upon a *presumption*, which, though metamorphosed into a *proof* in *three* lines after, See Tracts, p. 492, I thought it could not impose even upon the most careless reader: but having since examined Jerome, I have no objection to lay before the reader the entire passage (accompanied with a close translation) of Jerome, upon which this fancy

is grounded : and by thus doing, I shall put it in the power of every reader of common sense to form as true judgment upon this question, and perhaps a juster one, as unshackled with prejudices, as the most learned. The passage relates to the two first verses of the 9th chapter of Isaiah, which, Jerome observes, differ in the Hebrew and Samaritan copies ; and, as a fair writer should do, he lays translations of both passages before the reader, for him to determine which was to be preferred ; which good practice I shall follow.

Isaiah ix. Hebrew.

Primo tempore alle
viata est terra Zabulon,
et terra Neptalim, & no-
vissimo aggravata est via
maris trans Jordanem
Galilææ gentium. Po-
pulus qui ambulabat in
tenebris, vidit lucem
magnam habitantibus in
regione umbræ mortis,
lux orta est eis, &c.

Isaiah ix. Hebrew.

At the first the land of
Zabulon, and the land of
Naphtali, were lightly afflict-
ed, and afterwards were more
grievously afflicted by the
way of the sea beyond Jor-
dan Galilee of the Gentiles.
The people, who walked in
darkness, saw a great light :
On them that dwell in the
land of the shadow of death
the light hath shined.

Sept.

Septuagint,

Sept.

Septuagint.

Hoc primum bibe, velociter fac regio Zabulon, terra Neptalim: et reliqui qui juxta maris estis trans Jordanem Galilææ gentium. Populus qui ambulabat in tenebris vidit lucem magnam: qui habitatis in regione, et umbra mortis, lux orietur vobis.

Duplicem posuimus æditionem, quia vulgatum est testimonium, et usurpatum ab Evangelista Mathæo: ut *vel* diversitas interpretationis, *vel* similitudo noscatur. Ac primum notandum, quod testimonium hoc Evangelista Mathæus

non

First drink this, do it quickly, O ye land of Zabulon, and ye land of Neptali, and ye others who border upon the sea beyond Jordan Galilee of the Gentiles. The people, who walked in darkness, saw a great light. Upon you who dwell in the land and shadow of death the light hath shined.

‘ We have put down both texts, because the testimony is published, and mentioned by Matthew the Evangelist: as also that the disagreement, or the agreement of the interpretation, may be known. And first it is to be remarked, that Mathew hath cited this tes-

‘ timony

non juxta 70 sed juxta	timony, not according to
Hebræos posuerit. Di-	the 70, but according to
citur enim sermo evangeli-	the Hebrews. For the
cus: audiens autem Je-	Evangelist says, "Now Je-
sus quod Joannes esset	sus, when he had heard
traditus, secessit in Ga-	that John was cast into
lilæam: et derelinquens	prison, departed into Ga-
Nazareth, venit et habita-	lilee. And leaving Na-
vit in Capharnaum; quæ	zareth, he came and dwelt
est juxta mare in finibus	in Capernaum, which is
Zabulon et Neptalim: ut	upon the sea coast, in the
impleretur quod dictum	border of Zabulon and
est per Esaïam prophe-	Nephtalim: That it might
tam dicentem: terra	be fulfilled what was spok-
Zabulon, terra Nepta-	en by Esaïas the prophet,
lim, via maris, trans	saying, The land of Zabu-
Jordanem Galilææ Gen-	lon, and the land of Neph-
tium: populus qui se-	thalim, by the way of the
debat in tenebris, vi-	sea beyond Jordan Galilee
dit lucem magnam, se-	of the Gentiles: The peo-
dentibus in regione um-	ple, who sat in darkness,
bræ mortis, lux orta est	saw a great light: and to
eis: ex eo tempore cæ-	them that sat in the re-
pit	gion

pit Jesus prædicare & " gion and shadow of death,
dicere : appropinquabit " light is sprung up. From
regnum cœlorum. Et Jo- " that time Jesus began to
annes Evangelista refert, " preach, and to say, Repent,
quod Jesus cum discipu- " for the kingdom of heaven
lis suis in Chana Galilææ " is at hand. And John the
invitatus in nuptias, pri- " Evangelist relates, that Je-
mum ibi signum fecerit, " sus, with his disciples, be-
a aquas in vinum convert- " ing invited to a marriage
endo : hoc fecit princi- " feast in Cana of Galilee,
pium signorum Jesus in " performed there the first
Chana Galilææ : et mani- " miracle, by changing the
festavit gloriam suam : et " water into wine. " This
crediderunt in eum disci- " beginning of miracles did
puli ejus. Unde et in " Jesus in Cana of Galilee,
70 dicitur : hoc primum " and manifested forth his
bibe, velociter fac : quia " glory : and his disciples
terra Zabulon & terra " believed on him." Where-
Neptalim prima Christi " as it is said in the 70 :
vedere miracula : ut pri- " Drink this first, do it
mabiberet fidei potionem, " quickly : because the land
quæ prima viderat do- " of Zabulon and the land
minum signa facientem. " of Nephtalim saw the first

Et

' miracles

Et juxta Hebraicum : ' miracles of Christ : as it
 primo tempore relevata ' first drank a draught of the
 esse dicitur onere pec- ' faith, which saw the Lord
 catorum : quia in regio- ' performing the first mira-
 nibus duarum tribuum ' cles ; and, according to
 primum Salvator evan- ' the Hebrew, it is said to
 gelium prædicavit. Un- ' have been the first relieved
 de et in sexagesimo sep- ' from the burthen of its ini-
 timo Psalmo dicitur : ' quities : because that in the
 Benedicite Dominum de ' country of the two tribes
 fontibus Israel. Ibi Ben- ' the Saviour first preached
 jamin adolescentior, Pau- ' the Gospel. Whereas in
 lus apostolus, in mentis ' 67th Psalm [68th, accord-
 excessu. Qui et alibi lo- ' ing to our arrangement],
 quebatur, sive mente ex- ' it is said, Bless the Lord
 cedimus Deo : Principes ' from the fountains of Is-
 Zabulon, principes Nep- ' rael : there the younger Ben-
 talim duces eorum : quia ' jamin, the Apostle Paul, in
 in his tribubus fuerunt ' excesses of mind, who also
 viculi, de quibus duces ' elsewhere said, For whe-
 nostri apostoli credide- ' ther we be beside our-
 runt. Et crediderunt ' selves, it is to God.'
 juxta Symmachum velo-
 citer

citer, ut audientes : ve- ' the Princes of Zabulon,
 nite et faciam vos pis- ' the Prince of Neptalim
 catores hominum : sta- ' [were] their chiefs, because
 tim et patrem relique- ' the villages were in those
 rent et naviculam. No- ' tribes, out of which our
 vissimo autem tempore ' chiefs, the Apostles, be-
 aggravata est fides eorum, ' lieved. And according to
 plurimis Judæorum in ' Symmachus, they quickly
 erroribus permanentibus. ' believed, as, when they
 Mare autem hic lacum ' heard, Come, and I will
 appellat Genesaret, qui ' make you fishers of men :
 Jordane influente effici- ' immediately they left their
 tur : in cujus littore ' father and boat. But af-
 Capharnaum et Tibe- ' terwards their faith was
 rias et Bethsaida, et Cho- ' more grievously afflicted,
 rozaim sitæ sunt : in ' the greatest [number] con-
 qua, vel maxime, regione ' tinuing in the errors of the
 dominus commoratus est : ' Jews. But here he calls a
 ita ut populus, qui vel ' sea the Lake of Gennefa-
 sedebat vel ambulabat in ' reth, which is formed by
 tenebris, lucem videret : ' the influx of the Jordan,
 nequaquam parvam, ut ' on the shore of which Ca-
 aliorum prophetarum : ' pernaum, and Tiberias, and

sed magnam, ut ejus qui Bethsaida, and Chorozaim,
 in Evangelio loquitur. are situated: in which
 Ego sum lux mundi. country he even chiefly re-
 Et qui habitabant in re- sided: so that the people
 gione umbræ mortis, who either sat or walked in
 lux orta est eis. Inter darkness saw the light: by
 mortem, ut umbram mor- no means the small [light],
 tis, hoc esse puto: quod like [that] of the other pro-
 mors eorum est, qui cum phets: but a great [light],
 operibus mortis ad infe- like that which is spoken
 ros perrexerunt: anima of in the gospel: I am the
 enim quæ peccaverit, Light of the World. And
 ipsa morietur. Umbra on them who dwell in the
 autem mortis eorum est, land of the shadow of
 qui cum peccent, nec death, the light hath shin-
 dum de vita ista egressi ed. Between death and the
 sunt. Possint enim si shadow of death, I imagine
 voluerint agere poeni- to be this, that it is the
 tentiam. Pro Galilæa death of them who with
 Gentium: Aquila, *Thinas* the works of death will go
 Gentium; Symmachus, to hell, "for the soul
 terminos Gentium inter- which hath sinned, it shall
 pretati sunt: *Thinas* au- die." But the shadow of
 tem death

tem tumulos intelligimus	death are they, who, though
arenarum & qui <i>vel</i> in Lit-	they sin, have not as yet
toribus, <i>vel</i> in ripis sunt.	departed from this life:
Hebræi credentes in	for they may, if they have
Christum, hunc locum ita	a mind, repent. Instead of
<i>edisserunt</i> : primo tempore	Galilee of the Gentiles,
<i>hæ duæ</i> tribus Zabulon et	Aquila understood <i>Thinas</i> of
Neptalim ab Assyriis	the Gentiles; Symmachus,
<i>captæ</i> , et ductæ in hos-	<i>the borders</i> of the Gentiles:
tilem terram: et Galilæa	for <i>Thinas</i> means heaps of
deserta est, quam nunc	sand, which are either upon
propheta dicit alleviatam	the shores, or upon the
esse: eo quod peccata	banks. The Hebrews be-
populi sustineret. Postea	lieving in Christ learned
autem non solum duæ	this passage in this man-
tribus, sed et reliquæ quæ	ner: At the first the two
habitabant trans Jorda-	tribes of Zabulon and Ne-
nem et in Samaria, duc-	phalim were taken captive
tæ sunt in captivitatem.	by the Assyrians, and led
Et hoc, in quiunt, scrip-	into a foreign land, and Ga-
tura nunc dicit: quod	lilee was forsaken; which
regio cujus populus	the prophet says was now
primus ductus est in	lightly afflicted; because
captivitatem,	* F f 2 ' that

captivitatem, et Ba- byloniis servire cæpit : et quæ prius in tene- bris versabatur erroris ipsa primum lucem præ- dicantis viderit Christi, et ex ea in universas gen- tes sit evangelium semi- natum. Nazaræi, quo- rum opinionem supra posui, hunc locum ita <i>explanare</i> conantur : ad- veniente Christo et præ- dicatione illius coruf- cante : prima terra Za- bulon et terra Neptalim Scribarum et Phariseo- rum est erroribus libera- ta : et gravissimum tradi- tionum Judaicarum ju- gum excussit de cervi- cibus suis. Postea au- tem per evangelium A- postoli	that it upheld the trans- gressions of the people. But afterwards not only the two tribes; but the re- mainder which inhabited beyond the Jordan, and in Samaria, were led into capti- vity, and began to serve the Babylonians : and that ve- ry [land] which first was conversant in the darkness of error, first saw the light of Christ preaching : and from it the gospel was sown among all nations. The <i>Nazarenes</i> , whose opinions we have placed <i>above</i> , en- deavour thus to <i>explain</i> this passage : By the coming of Christ, and his preaching shining forth; the land of Zabulon, and the land of Neptalim, were first libe- rated
---	---

postoli Pauli, qui novissimus apostolorum omnium fuit, ingravata est, id est, multiplicata prædicatio: et in terminos Gentium, et viam universæ maris Christi evangelium splenduit. Denique omnis orbis, qui ante ambulabat vel sedebat in tenebris, et idolatriæ ac mortis vinculis tenebatur, clarum evangelii lumen aspexit.

‘ rated from the errors of
 ‘ Scribes and Pharisees, and
 ‘ shook off from their necks
 ‘ the heaviest yoke of the
 ‘ Jewish traditions. But afterwards, by the gospel of
 ‘ the Apostle Paul, who was
 ‘ the last called of all the
 ‘ Apostles, the preaching increased, that is, was multiplied even in the borders,†
 ‘ of the Gentiles, and the
 ‘ gospel of Christ shone by
 ‘ the way of the universal
 ‘ sea*. Finally, the clear
 ‘ light of the gospel shone
 ‘ upon the whole world,
 ‘ which before walked, or sat
 ‘ in darkness, and was held
 ‘ in the chains of darkness and
 ‘ death.

His Lordship observes, that there are two expositions of the original of Isaiah here given by Jerome, one by the [Hebrew] *Believers in Christ*, and the

† Symmachus.

* Aquila.

the other by the *Nazarenes*; and that as the expositions differ so widely from one another; and as the persons, to whom they are ascribed, differ also in name, his Lordship concludes, that the sects must have been *different*. I trust this is a fair statement of his Lordship's argument: see, however, his 6th Disquisition. I admit that there are *two* expositions here given: the first, that which was generally received by the *Hebrews believing in Christ*, and, as such, these Hebrew believers in Christ are said to have *learned* the first exposition; and not as his Lordship insinuates, that *they thus expounded* it; for the word *edisco*, is to learn, to learn thoroughly, to learn by heart; and therefore, instead of having expounded it themselves, they were only taught this explanation, as that generally received among the Jewish believers. His Lordship also supposes, that the Nazarenes mentioned towards the conclusion of this passage, were the same Nazarenes, whose opinions upon two other points Jerome had given in the *preceding* chapter. There would be, no doubt, some grounds for his supposition, were they not the *very same opinions* of Aquila and Symmachus, which are set forth in the latter explanation:

explanation: 'for the *borders of the Gentiles* was the
 'manner in which Symmachus understood *Galilee of*
 '*the Gentiles*;' and '*the Thinas, or heaps of sand of*
 '*Aquila*;' is, in my apprehension, equivalent to the
 '*by the way of the universal sea*.' If I am well ground-
 ed in thus understanding the latter exposition, it will
 prove, first, that this latter exposition was only a par-
 ticular one of Aquila or Symmachus, just as Bishop
 Horsley might happen to think differently from
 other orthodox Trinitarians about some disputed pas-
 sage: For instance, the so-much disputed passage con-
 cerning the heavenly witnesses in John's First Epis-
 tle; yet it followed not, that it was a general
 Trinitarian sentiment, but only a particular one
 of his Lordship's. It will 2dly prove, that Aquila
 and Symmachus, who are acknowledged to have
 been *Ebionites*, were also *Nazarenes*, and conse-
 quently, that the *Nazarenes* and *Ebionites* are *prov-*
ed to have been the *same* sect from the very passage
 adduced by his Lordship to prove they were dif-
 ferent.

His Lordship also observes, p. 374, that *Hebraei cre-*
dentes in Christo, or '*Hebrews believing in Christ*,'
 being

being simply mentioned by Jerome without any thing to distinguish their belief from the common belief of the church ; without any notes of its error or imperfection, is a *plain character of orthodoxy*. This position is very singular. The question, however, is, whether it be well founded. The following passage from Augustine, in his letter to Jerome, will determine this point. He thus writes : “ We have four men
 “ which have a vow on them ; them take and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with
 “ them, that they may shave their heads ; and
 “ all may know, that these things, whereof they
 “ are informed concerning thee, are nothing, but
 “ that thou thyself walkest orderly, and keepest the
 “ law. As touching the Gentiles which believe, we
 “ have written and concluded, that they observe
 “ no such things, save only that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood,
 “ and from fornication. Nor do I think it obscure,
 “ that James advised this ; for this reason : that those
 “ of the *Jews who believed in Christ* should know that
 “ these things were false which they heard concerning
 “ him : nevertheless, the zealots of the law, lest that
 “ those

“those things, which were written by the command of
 “God, and which were delivered to their fathers by
 “Moses, should be supposed to be condemned as sacrile-
 “gious, by means of the doctrine of Christ, had report-
 “ed this of Paul : not they who understood with what
 “view these things ought now to be observed by the
 “*faithful Jews* ; to wit, in order that the *divine autho-*
 “*rity and prophetic sanctity* of their sacraments might
 “be *recommended* ; not to obtain salvation, which was
 “now revealed in Christ, and administered by the sa-
 “crament of Baptism* : but *they* rumoured this of

* Sunt nobis viri quatuor, votum habentes super se : his assumptis
 sanctifica te cum ipsis, et impende in eos ut radant capita : et sciant
 omnes quia quæ de te audierunt falsa sunt, sed sequeris et ipse custodiens
 legem : de gentibus autem qui crediderunt nos mandavimus, judicantes
 nihil ejusmodi servare illos, nisi ut se observent ab idolis immolato, et
 a sanguine, et a fornicatione. Non, ut opinor, obscurum est, et Jacobum
 hoc ideo monuisse, ut scirent falsa esse quæ de illo audierant, hi qui cum
 in Christum ex Judæis credidissent : tamen æmulatores legis, ne per doc-
 trinam Christi, velut sacrilega, nec Deo mandante conscripta damnari
 putarentur, quæ per Moysen Patribus fuerant ministrata. Hoc enim de
 Paulo jactaverant : non illi qui intelligebant quo animo a Judæis fide-
 bus observari tunc ista deberent, propter commendandam scilicet autori-
 tatem divinam, et sacramentorum illorum prophetica sanctitatem : non
 propter adipiscendam salutem, quæ jam in Christo revelabatur, et per
 baptismum sacramentum ministrabatur. Sed illi hoc de Paulo sparserant,
 qui sic ea volebant observari, tanquam sine his in evangelio salus credenti-
 bus esse non posset. Hieron. Op. vol. ii. p. 354.

“ Paul ; who would have them to be *so* observed as
 “ if the believers in the gospel could not otherwise
 “ obtain salvation.” Hence the reader perceives, that
 the *Jews who believed in Christ*, whom Bishop Horsley
 affirms to have been ‘ *Orthodox Christians of Hebrew*
 ‘ *extraction, who laid aside the use of the Mosaic law,*
 p. 384, were, on the contrary, according to August-
 tine, so bigotted to it, that they not only practised it
 themselves, but the zealots of them *denied salvation* to
 those who did not do so likewise. And I apprehend
 that Augustine, in the present instance, and writing
 in controversy may be deemed somewhat *better* evi-
 dence in this particular than his Lordship : and that
 if any of the Jews came up to his Lordship’s notions
 of orthodoxy, it must be the *faithful Jews* above no-
 ticed by Augustine. And what Jerome thought of
 those *believing Jews*, whom he simply mentions, ‘ with-
 ‘ out any thing to distinguish their belief from the
 ‘ common belief of the church,’ appears from his letter
 to Augustine, in which he writes, ‘ for whilst you
 ‘ are afraid of the blaspheming Porphyry, you are run-
 ‘ ning into the snares of Ebion, by determining, with
 ‘ those

‘those of the *Jews who believe*, that the law is to be
‘observed*.’

To what can be attributed this positiveness of his Lordship, in asserting a difference between the Nazarenes and Ebionites, when the very passages, adduced by him for this end, prove the contrary? I shall not, after the example of the learned Mr. Howes, with regard to Dr. Priestley, impute it to a *disputatious* talent, for the erroneousness of the notion is too obvious to admit of a dispute. I can only attribute it to a *contradictious* talent. However, it may be, that his Lordship † was aware, that if these two names were in the 4th century applicable to the same sect, it would be, next to the reasonableness of the Ebionite notion, the strongest proof—a *decisive* proof,

* Dum enim metuis Porphyrium blasphemem: in Hebionis incurris laqueos, his qui credunt ex Judæis observandam legem deceruens.

† His Lordship admits, p. 98, 99, that if the Hebrew Christians [i. e. believers in Jesus] and the Nazarenes can be proved to have been the *same*, and that the Nazarene and Ebionite faith [respecting Jesus] was the *same*, the argument would be *complete* for the Unitarian notion of the *proper Humanism* of Jesus. As I trust that I have clearly shewn that these three appellations were indifferently applied to the Jewish believers, among whom there were *no* differences respecting their notions of Jesus, the *proper Humanism* of Jesus must then be acknowledged by his Lordship.

that the Ebionites being indifferently named Nazarenes, or Ebionites, retained the genuine doctrines preached by the Apostles, together with the original nick-name given by the unbelieving Jews to the followers of Jesus.

I really intended to have here finished my remarks upon his Lordship; but a letter in the Gentleman's Magazine for Oct. 1789, apparently from a person of his Lordship's sentiments, respecting the meaning of the word *Idiota*, in the passage cited from Tertulian in the Pre. Disq. p. 54, n. 29, induces me to lay before the reader my sentiments respecting that (as I think) very obvious question.

His Lordship, in rendering that passage, has translated the words *idiotæ* by *idiots*. Dr. Priestley thereupon asks his Lordship, "Pray, Sir, in what lexicon or dictionary, ordinary or extraordinary, did you find this sense of the term *idiotæ* in Latin, or *ιδιωτης* in Greek?" To which his Lordship thus answers: Tracts, p. 430.

' I will now refer him to certain lexicons, never
' known, perhaps, in the academy of Warrington, but
' such as a late Greek professor there [Dr. Priestley],
' might

‘ might have occasionally condescended to consult,
 ‘ with advantage to himself and to his pupils. The
 ‘ first is that old glossary which was found annexed to
 ‘ some copies of St. Cyril, and is published by Hen-
 ‘ ry Stephens, in the appendix to his Greek Thesau-
 ‘ rus. In this glossary the word *ιδιωτης* is expounded
 ‘ by *ο μη νοημων*, words which express not the want of
 ‘ education, but dulness in the natural faculties.’ [*νοημων*
 is expounded in Constantine’s lexicon by *intelligens*,
doctus, *sapiens*, *mentis compos*.] ‘ The 2d is Robert
 ‘ Stephens’s *Dictionary Latino-Gallicum*, in which
 ‘ the word *Idiota* is rendered *ung lourdault*,’ [a heavy
 fellow] ‘ *qui n’ est pas des plus fins du monde*,’ [who is
 not the sharpest man in the world] ‘ *qui ne’st pas du*
 ‘ *grand esprit*,’ [no great genius] ‘ *idiot*. The 3d is
 ‘ the learned Calepini’s *Dictionary Octolingue*, in
 ‘ which the author gives the French words *Lourdaut*,
 ‘ *sot*, *ignorant*, and the English words, *an idiot*, *a fool**,
 ‘ as rendering the Latin *idiota*. The 4th is the The-

* His Lordship is not authorised by the learned Calepini for rendering *Idiota* by the English terms *idiot*, *fool*, for Calepini gave not English synonyms for the Latin words in his dictionary published in his lifetime; so that the Bishop’s authority for this exposition is, perhaps, only that of some ignorant editor.

This

‘ saurus of our learned countryman Cooper, in which
 ‘ *idiot* is thus expounded—one that is not very fine
 ‘ *witted*; an *idiot*. If my adversary demand the au-
 ‘ thority of an ordinary dictionary, I will refer him
 ‘ to a very ordinary dictionary indeed; to a dic-
 ‘ tionary in every school-boy’s hand. Let him turn
 ‘ to the word *idiot* in Ainsworth, he will find among
 ‘ its first senses, *an idiot*.’

This is his Lordship’s answer, and in his own words.
 That the common reader may be perfectly master of
 the question, I shall first lay before him what the
 learned Calepini says upon the word *idiot*, first pre-
 mising, that my edition (for there are various ones)
 is of Padua, 1772, and entitled *Septem Linguarum*.
 “ *Idiota seu Idiotæ*—[Ital.] *idiot*, *ignorante*, Ger.
 “ *ein schlechte person*, Gal. *idiot*, Hisp. *ydiota*, יְדִיאוֹן
 “ [Gr.] *proprie notat hominem privatum, seu nullo*
 “ *munere publico fungentem; sed quia qui e vulgo*
 “ *sunt fere imperiti, indoctique esse consueverunt,*
 “ *accipitur fere a Latinis pro illiterato, indocto, im-*
 “ *perito, ab ἰδιος privatus, proprius, Cic. 7. Ver.*
 “ *Quæ non modo istum hominem ingeniosum atque*
 “ *intelligentem, verum etiam quemvis nostrum, quos*
 “ *iste*

“ iste idiotas a pellat, delectare possent. Id. pro Sext.
 “ 31. Rem paternam ab idiotarum divitiis ad philoso-
 “ phorum regulam perduxit.” ‘ Idiota properly de-
 ‘ notes a private man, or a person in no public employ-
 ‘ ment; but, because the vulgar are accustomed to be
 ‘ generally unskilful, and *unlearned*, the term is gene-
 ‘ rally received by the Latins for an illiterate, *unlearn-*
 ‘ *ed*, unskilful [person], ‘ from *idios* [which signifies]
 ‘ one’s own. Cic. against Verres, 7.’ Which things may
 ‘ delight not only “this ingenious, and intelligent
 “ man, but also some of *us*, whom he calls *idiotæ*.”
 Every one can readily perceive, that the *idiotæ* in
 this passage, were not persons devoid of understand-
 ing, but only of *taste*; which may, with truth, be
 asserted of mankind in general: but *idiots* means
 persons, who cannot draw conclusions from premises,
 or that are incapable of arguing, from being devoid
 of common sense: persons very different from the *idi-*
otæ mentioned by Cicero. One would think, how-
 ever, that his Lordship, by adducing the terms *lour-*
daut, *stot*, *ignorant*, *fool*, *idiot*, would have it understood
 that these terms were the proper rendering of the Latin
idiotæ. If this was his Lordship’s view, I would not
 scruple

scruple to affirm, that he intended to *impose* upon ignorant, or *heedless* readers: for, as Calepini observes, *idiot* properly signifies a man in a private capacity; and I will venture to affirm *never* an idiot, in the legal signification of this term in English, in any Latin author, for two centuries after Christ. His Lordship, indeed, acknowledges that he did not use it in this sense: but I can by no means grant to his Lordship that he is justifiable in expounding his author, except with the *strictest* conformity to the original; a liberty which he frequently indulges himself in; for the exposition is generally so contrived, as to efface in *ordinary* readers the impression which the original passage should naturally produce.

His Lordship surely is not to be informed, that many persons of very good common understandings are familiarly called *idiots*, *fools*, when not quick at comprehending what is laid before them; and only in this popular sense can they be *at all* said to be comprehended under the Latin term *idiot*; but, even in this *extended* signification, I apprehend, that his Lordship would find it difficult to produce, an instance of *idiot* having been thus used, from any Latin author

prior

prior to, or contemporary with, Tertullian. But, be this as it may, Tertullian's words absolutely exclude his *idiotæ* from being persons to whom *our* term *idiot* can at all apply; for in English this word excludes the power of reasoning. Not so Tertullian's *idiotæ*: for they, poor souls! conceived, that preaching *two* or *three* Gods, was an infringement of the *one* God and *sole* source of universal nature, and, perhaps, had they been acquainted with his Lordship's notion respecting the *arrangement* of that, of which nothing in nature can give even a *faint* shadow of its *oneness*, or *unity*, they might be stupid enough, or, if his Lordship chooses, such idiots, as to stand 'aghast' at such a nonsensical notion.

But the true rendering of this passage is as in *Præ. Disq.* p. 54. "For some open people, I would not
 " call them imprudent, and persons not employ-
 " ed in the service of the church, who are always
 " the majority of believers," &c. So that *imprudentes* refers only to *simplices*, and not at all to *idiotæ*, as his Lordship apprehends, *Tracts*, p. 431. This, I affirm, *must* be true sense of the passage; nor can it be at all disputed, till his Lordship, or some other person,

shall point out a passage in an author *prior* to Tertullian, by whom *idiotæ* is used, as descriptive of persons of *inferior* capacity to *imprudentes*, or in a *worse* sense as applied to persons. If his Lordship's notion was well founded, the meaning of the passage would be this: "For some open people, and idiots, I " would not call them imprudent." After calling people *idiots* in any sense of the word, there was no occasion, I apprehend, for an apology for calling them *imprudent*. This single argument is sufficient to shew the fallacy of his Lordship's notion: however, I may add, that the words *ne dixerim imprudentes*, or, 'I would not call them imprudent,' is obviously a parenthesis: they may be entirely taken away, without at all injuring the sense. I shall therefore affirm, that for any writer (especially a person of his Lordship's abilities and information) to contend for *idiot* being a true rendering of *idiotæ* in this passage of Tertullian, displays a hardness of 'assurance' unparalleled, I apprehend, in the annals of controversy. Should any answer, or defence of his Lordship's rendering, be offered to the public, the unlearned are requested to be upon their guard against *idiot*,
fool,

fool, or such like *inaccurate synonymes* being obtruded on them : for the question here is, what the Latin term *idiotæ* means ; and therefore it is to be *expounded* or *defined*, and *one* term can *never* expound or define *another*, for itself will still require to be expounded or defined, and the justness of the definition is to be *proved* by a citation from some Latin author *prior* to Tertullian ; for till all this be done, his Lordship's rendering is *untenable*. The unlearned can never be too much upon their guard against *sound*, which frequently is in opposition to *sense*, and is often made use of by *unfair* writers, to lead astray the *majority*.

Moreover, I will observe, that the above translation *must* be the true rendering, and for this reason, that it only corresponds to fact : for his Lordship's *simplices*, or simple people, *never yet* constituted the *majority* of any society ; but persons in private capacities have *ever*, and always '*semper*,' will be, the *majority* of every society.

I am also to observe, that his Lordship quotes this passage very inaccurately. Thus *simplices enim* (nec *dixerim imprudentes et idiotæ*), Horsley, Tracts, p. 175. *simplices enim* quique, ne *dixerim imprudentes, et idiotæ*,

Tert. Omitting *quique*, and putting into a parenthesis *nec dixerim*, &c. and writing *nec* instead of *ne*. It is true, as *points* and *parentheses* are modern inventions, that an author may be justified in altering the punctuation; but, I apprehend, that he should not deviate from the most approved editors, when writing for the unlearned, without giving notice of it; which, in what regards myself, I now do, by observing, that I place a comma after *imprudentes*, whereas, in Rigaltius's edition, there is none. Tertullian wrote without commas, and if any are to be put, there must be one after *imprudentes*, otherwise he will assert a notorious falsehood.

But it may be also demanded by the unlearned reader, how comes it that I, who make no pretensions to learning or ingenuity, have had the presumption to point this passage differently from the *learned* Rigaltius, and the Bishop of St. David's, whose accomplishments in literature are the theme of *orthodox* Britain. Besides, that I should translate *simplices* 'open,' whereas his Lordship translates it 'simple.' My apology, I look on, with regard to the first point, to be already
partly

partly made: but that the unlearned may be perfect masters of the question, I shall translate it agreeably to Rigaltius's *absurd* punctuation; and afterwards according to his Lordship's farther 'intension' of Rigaltius's *absurd* punctuation, by putting the member into a parenthesis; for if points and parentheses are to be introduced in ancient writings by the moderns, they should be so introduced as to make the author speak agreeably to truth and common sense. According to Rigaltius we should then translate, "For *some* "open persons, I would not call them imprudent "and persons in a private capacity, who are always "the *majority* of believers," &c. By this punctuation persons in a *private capacity* are supposed to be 'the "some open people,' and at the same time to be the *majority*, which is a contradiction, and consequently absurd. According to his Lordship's punctuation, we should translate "some open persons, (I would "not call them imprudent and persons in a pri- "vate capacity) who always make the majority of be- "lievers,"—here the *some*, by securing in a parenthesis 'I would not, &c.' are *absolutely* made the *majority*, which is, as I said, a farther 'intension' of Rigaltius's absurdity,

absurdity; as his mode of pointing the passage admits a doubt with regard to his manner of understanding the passage; but his Lordship's admits of none.

As to the word *simplices*, which I translated *open* I think I am justified in so doing, by the learned Calepini, who informs me, that, when applied to *things*, *simplices* means *pure, simple, uncompounded*, but *open-heartedness*, when applied to *persons*. But the unlearned reader shall hear Calepini himself speak. 1st 'Simplex quod nullo modo compositum est, ut sunt quatuor mundi elementa, *terra, aqua, ignis, aer*.—2dly. Translate accipitur pro *puro, aperto, libero*, Cic. 4 Acad. Cum simplici hominem simpliciter agerem, &c.—1st. Simplex; that which is not at all compounded, as the four elements of the world, *earth, water, fire, air*.—2dly. It is metaphorically taken for *pure, open, liberal*, Cic. 4 Acad. 'With a candid or open man I would act candidly or openly.' What will the unlearned reader now think? I apprehend he *must* conclude that his Lordship, by so egregiously mistranslating two such obvious words as *simplices* and *idiotæ*, intended to impose on the common herd of readers, who generally put up with

sound

found for sense. I own that any scholar should miss the sense of so very obvious a passage, appears to me *astonishing*, seeing that the term *imprudent*, should have led him to the true meaning of the term *simplices*, it being a common defect of *open* persons to be *imprudent*.

I shall here venture to make a *supposition*, which prudence should restrain me from, considering the egregious blunders made by such an eminent scholar: but the reader is only to regard it as the *guess* of an unlearned man; namely, from the obvious contrast between the *quique* or *some*, and the *quæ major pars* or *majority*, I apprehend, that *simplices* must have been *honest open-hearted clergy*, or *persons in a public function in the assemblies of the faithful*; for if they were not, they must have been included among the *idiotæ*: in this case *imprudentes* would, with great propriety, be affirmed of them, for such conduct might prevent their rising to the honours and emoluments of the church; as I have heard it said, though I am sure *falsely*, that such conduct would be so punished at this day. However, it may be that his Lordship had this vulgar notion in his mind, which would naturally

turally induce him to conceive that all who were so *imprudent*, were *simpletons* and *idiots*. For my own part I cannot account for his Lordship's mistakes, upon so obvious a passage, upon any other principle.

I shall also observe that the second part of Dr. Priestley's challenge is not so much as noticed by his Lordship; and from his Lordship's silence upon this head, the unlearned reader may safely conclude that it could not be answered; as, till the second part of the Doctor's challenge was answered, all that he has written in reply to the first, as the learned must know, is of no value; and the two challenges, being in connection, the Doctor, it may be well supposed, intended that they should be taken in connection. The Doctor says, 'Pray, Sir, in what lexicon or 'dictionary, ordinary or extraordinary, did you 'find this sense of the term *idiotæ* in Latin, or ' *ιδιωται* in Greek? Can you produce *any* passage in 'an ancient writer in which the word has that mean- 'ing?' Second Letter, page 63. No such passage has been adduced by his Lordship!

As I hope that I have now shewn, that his Lord-
ship

ship has entirely misapprehended the meaning of this passage; and as his Lordship alludes (in his second Disquisition, in which he contends for the justness of his exposition of it) to Dr. Priestley's having misunderstood the *quid dicam*, &c. of Jerome, see p. 191, &c. which, I hope, I have satisfactorily proved, in opposition to the late Mr. Badcock, that *he did not*; I think it incumbent upon his Lordship, like a gallant and generous knight, to step forth, and defend the cause of his able and valuable ally, now, alas! no longer capable of defending himself: and, if he does not, I apprehend the world may justly conclude, that the sentiment of these learned gentlemen is *untenable*.

His Lordship says, p. 199, 'Now, Sir,' [Dr. Priestley] if "the then Jews," οἱ τότε Ἰουδαῖοι [See the original of Athanasius, Pre. Disq. p. 10.] 'may denote Jewish Christians, will you be pleased to inform me, what *more precise* expressions the holy Fathers might have found in the *whole compass* of the Greek language, to denote genuine Jewish Jews, had he had occasion to mention them.' This appears to me to be very vaunting language:

however I hope the reader does not forget, that I there *proved*, that these *Jewish Jews* happened to be *Jewish believers*. Mr. Badcock says ‘ *Iudæi* always mean in Athanasius, as far as we have consulted him, ‘ *unbelieving Jews*; and *Ἕλληνες*, and *Ἕλληνα φρονιμάλα*, *unbelieving Gentiles*, and their opinions.’ Monthly Review, vol. lxi. p. 234, note, referring to the same passage of Athanasius. With what truth Mr. Badcock could say this, I trust, every reader can determine. May I ask his Lordship, who lays such a *mighty stress* on *sound*, who are the *Judæi* in the following passage of Cyprian, and ‘ what more precise expression the holy ‘ Father might have found in the whole compass of the ‘ Latin language to denote *Jewish Jews*, had he had ‘ occasion to mention them?’ Si autem carnale [baptisma] nihil differunt a *Judæorum* baptisate, quo sic illi utuntur, ut eo tanquam communi et vulgari lavacro tantum sordes laventur. Ep. ad Firm. p. 223. “ But if carnal,” [baptism] “ it does not differ from “ the baptism of the Jews, which they so use as “ any other common washing for removing filth.” Nevertheless these *Jews* must have been *Gentile* believers, and not at all Jews; for these, whether believers or unbelievers, never baptized. The fact is,

that

that the Orthodox were accustomed to call Jews all believers in Jesus who *denied* that he was the Christ, and affirmed that he was a *mere* man, knowing nothing of, or not troubling themselves about, the Word——Prolations——Protenfions, and such like nonsense, about which the various sects of Christians were worrying one another. This the intelligent reader may have perceived in some of the passages adduced in these sheets.

As I have frequently intimated, that I have not read the Fathers, and scarcely know them, except through the moderns, I was not aware of the importance of the passage cited, Pre. Disq. p. 20, n. 11, at the time; but in comparing the citation with the original, I perceived the chapter of Theodoret, whence it was taken, proves beyond a doubt, that every Nazarene, according to this writer, was an Ebionite; and as the chapter is short, it shall be given entire. Theodoret says of the Ebionites, L. II. ch. ii. “ *Ebion* “ was the author of this phalanx, for the *Hebrews* thus “ call a beggar. This person said, indeed, in like manner with us, that there was one unbegotten, and “ taught that He was the maker of the world. But

“ He said, that the Lord *Jesus Christ* was born of
 “ *Joseph* and *Mary*; being indeed a man, but excelling
 “ other men in virtue and purity; and He lived agree-
 “ ably to the law of *Moses*. They [*Ebionites*] re-
 “ ceived the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and
 “ call the Apostle [*Paul*] an Apostate. *Symmachus**
 “ was one of these who translated the Old Scripture
 “ [*Old Testament*] from Hebrew into Greek. But,
 “ besides these, there is another division having the
 “ same name, for these also are called *Ebionites*, who
 “ indeed confess all the other things with the former,
 “ but say, that the Saviour and Lord was born of a
 “ Virgin. These only make use of the Gospel ac-
 “ cording to ^{*Matthew*} ~~Mark~~: they honour the Sabbath ac-
 “ cording to the law of the Jews, and sanctify the
 “ Lord’s-day in like manner with us†.” This passage
 in

† Ταυτησι δε της φαλαγγος ηρξεν Εβιων, τον πτωχον δε ουτως Εβραιοι
 προςαγορευουσιν. ουλος ενα μεν τον αγεννητον εφη παραπλησιως ημιν, κ
 αυτον εδειξεν Ιησυν Χριστον εξ Ιωσηφ κ της Μαρίας εφησε γεγεννησ-
 θαι, ανθρωπον μεν ουλα, αρετη δε κ καθαροτητι των αλλων διαφεροντα,
 καλα δε τον Μωσαιικον πολυλευοντα νομον. μονον δε καλα Εβραις
 ευαγγελιον δεχονται, τον δε αποστολον αποσταλην καλουν. Εκ Ιβλων ην
 Συμμαχος, ο Ιην παλαιαν γραφην εκ της Εβραιης μελατεδεικως εις
 την

* V. p. 222. where Jerome makes him a Nazarene.

in connexion with what goes before and follows after, proves that the Ebionites and Nazarenes held the same opinions concerning Jesus. For in the preface to the 2d. book of his Heretical Fables after speaking of the Gnostics he concludes it with saying, that
 “ the Devil had raised up *others* against the truth,
 “ who set forth doctrines the very opposite to those
 “ maintained by the above-named heretics; and Ebion
 “ was the leader of this phalanx” &c. as in the passage just rendered; after which immediately follows,
 ‘ But the Nazarenes are Jews honouring Christ as a just
 ‘ man, and who use the gospel called according to
 ‘ Peter. Eusebius relates, that during the reign
 ‘ of Domitian, these heresies sprung up. Against
 ‘ which Justin the Philosopher, and Martyr, and Iren-
 ‘ æus the successor of the Apostles, and Origen wrote.’
 Here then we have this learned writer’s explicit testimony that the only difference between the Ebionites and

την Ελλάδα φωνήν. Αλλά δε παρὰ Ἰαυήν συμμορία τὴν αὐτὴν ἐπωνυμίαν
 ἔχουσα, Ἐβιωνεῖς γὰρ καὶ οὗτοι προσαγορευοῦνται, τὰ ἀλλὰ μὲν ἀπάντα
 συνομολογεῖ τοῖς προτέροις, τὸν δὲ σῶτῆρα καὶ κύριον ἐκ παρθένου γεγεν-
 ῆσθαι φησὶν. Εὐαγγελίῳ δὲ τῷ κατὰ Ματθαίον ^{Ἰσραὶλ} κεχρημένῳ μόνῳ, καὶ
 τὸ μὲν σαββατοῦ κατὰ τὸν Ἰσραὴλιν τιμῶσι νόμον, τὴν δὲ κυριακὴν
 καθιεροῦσι παραπλησίως ἡμῖν. Hær. fab. l. 2. c. 1.

Naza-

Nazarenes was, that the first were Gentiles, the 2d, of Jewish extraction; but, that concerning Christ, they entertained the same opinions. It also proves against his Lordship that this sect existed *forty* years prior to the *Æra* assigned by Him: but, what is of infinitely greater importance is that it shews that Trypho the Jew, in Justin Martyr's dialogues, was a Nazarene, or Ebionite; so that by a diligent perusal of this work as well as those of the other writers cited by Him, their peculiar notions may be discovered. What they were with regard to the Incarnation, may be known from their deeming it to be "incredible, but even an old woman's story."* This testimony cannot be resisted, and will I trust be deemed equal to the importance of the fact. This learned writer seems not to have known of any *high* orthodox Nazarenes: with regard to the Incarnation they agreed with Dr. Priestley. The terms *others* and *Phalanx* being applied to them seems to infer that they had various appellations; for certainly *two* ill comports with 'others' 'Phalanx.' The reader will perceive that this is the most important question laid before the public for 1700 years, for if the Nazarenes cannot

* παραδοξον αλλα κ' μωρον

cannot be proved to be a different sect from the Ebionites there can remain no doubt but that the Ebionite faith was that which was proposed by Jesus.

I have also said that Cerinthus was an Ebionite. The Bishop and Dr. Priestley say he was a Gnostic. What! a Gnostic, whose object was to account for the origin of evil from the *limited* powers of the Creator, or his *malevolence*, yet to continue to worship and to follow the institutions of this *finite* or *malevolent* Being after the manifestation of the *Christ*, who, according to them, came solely to rectify, or destroy his kingdom, yet to avow himself a disciple of *Christ*, and to worship at the same time his *adversary*, this *limited* or *malevolent* Being Surely this is too great an absurdity to be credited even by a Trinitarian. What! a *Gentile*, who did not believe in the *God* of the *Jews*, but thought him a malevolent Being, yet to follow his institutions. What absurdity! I trust we shall hear no more of Cerinthian Gnostics—a Protestant Papist is not a greater contradiction. The reader will not forget that Jerome and Augustine couple Cerinthus and Ebion together, as holding the same tenets; which, with this passage of Theodoret, proves that they did
not

not differ *materially* in their faiths, if *at all*. But, independently of these three writers, Jerome, Augustine, and Theodoret, I undertake to prove elsewhere that the Cerinthians, and many other sects, under different appellations, were Ebionites. I have presumed, that Origen's Double Ebionites were Gentile believers, who thought as the Ebionites. I apprehend, that this passage of Theodoret *supports* the presumption—taken in connection with Jerome and Augustine, See p. 195, and 198, *proves* it.

What I said in the beginning of the former paragraph will, I trust, apologize for this: besides, that I can, with truth, add, that I did not think it was possible for any man, much more a Right Rev. Divine, to lay before the public so gross, so *palpable* a misrepresentation of an antient writer, as the Bishop has done in the following paragraph, which I shall cite at full length His. Lordship says, p. 477, see also p. 125, &c. of this work, ‘the work of Celsus
 ‘against Christianity being lost, neither the plan nor
 ‘the method of it is otherwise to be known, than from
 ‘what may be gathered from Origen's answer. It
 ‘appears from Origen, that it was a composition of
 ‘much

‘ much art, and highly laboured. Many of Celsus’s
 ‘ objections were delivered in the person of a Jew, who
 ‘ is supposed to address his discourse first to Jesus, and
 ‘ afterwards to the Hebrew Christians. In the dis-
 ‘ course addressed to the Hebrew Christians, Celsus
 ‘ makes his Jew upbraid them with a desertion of
 ‘ the Mosaic law. To this reproach Origen, in vin-
 ‘ dication of the Hebrew brethren, gives a double an-
 ‘ swer; which I have shewn to be inconsistent with
 ‘ itself in the two different branches. First, he asserts,
 ‘ that the Jews believing in Christ had not renounced
 ‘ their Judaism. Upon occasion of this assertion, he
 ‘ goes into a discourse of some length about St.
 ‘ Peter’s adherence to the Mosaic law, and the infor-
 ‘ mation that was conveyed to that Apostle in a
 ‘ vision, concerning the extinction of its authority.
 ‘ From this discourse he runs into a second, upon
 ‘ a saying of our Lord’s, which he expounds as an
 ‘ ænigmatical allusion to the intended abrogation of
 ‘ the Law. And when, in this *digressive* way, he
 ‘ hath written ‘*about it and about it,*’ till he himself
 ‘ had *forgotten*, or might reasonably trust that his
 ‘ reader would have forgotten, the position with which
 ‘ this *prolix* discourse began, he enters upon the

‘ second branch of his defence of the Hebrew brethren,
 ‘ in which he flatly contradicts his first assertion; in-
 ‘ sulting over Celsus’s ignorance, who had not made
 ‘ his Jew distinguish the different sects of converted
 ‘ Hebrews; two which observed the Law, and one
 ‘ which to all intents and purposes had abandoned it.
 ‘ I have given this passage at length in my remarks
 ‘ on Dr. Priestley’s Second Letters, and shall not tire
 ‘ the reader’s patience with a needless repetition of
 ‘ it.’

Now that this is as *palpable* a misrepresentation as
 has ever been obtruded upon the public, will evi-
 dently appear, by laying the *entire* section of Origen
 before the reader, which *single* section contains the
two branches, of which I shall give a translation,
 putting in Italics that part of it which divides the
 branches, to which his Lordship alludes in the words
 likewise marked in Italics in the preceding para-
 graph. Origen says, Book ii. Sect. 3. “ It is my
 “ present purpose to evince Celsus’s ignorance, who
 “ has made a Jew say to his countrymen, to Israel-
 “ ites believing in Christ, Upon what motive have
 “ you deserted the law of your ancestors? But how
 “ have they deserted the law of their ancestors, who
 “ reprove

“reprove those who are inattentive to it, and say; Tell
 “me, ye who read the Law, do ye not hearken to the Law;
 “for it is written that Abraham had two sons: and what
 “follows to these words, which are spoken allegorically.
 “Or have they forsaken their Law, who are always
 “citing it in their discourses: for instance, does not the
 “Law say this? For it is written in the Law of Moses,
 “thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out corn.
 “Does God mind oxen; or was not the Law written for
 “us? and so forth*.” “And how confusedly does
 “Celsus’s Jew speak upon this subject? when he
 “might have said more plausibly, some of you have
 “relinquished the customs, upon pretence of exposi-
 “tions and allegories. And some of you, expound-
 “ing spiritually, preserve your customs not a whit the

* Τον νομον αναγινωσκοντες, η ακουετε; γεγραπται γαρ οτι Αβρααμ
 δυω υιους εσχε· μεχραι των, αλινα εστιν αλληγορευμενα, κη τα εξης. κη
 πως καλαλελοιπασι τον πατριον νομον, οι αει μεμνημενοι εν τοις λογοις
 εκυλων, των πατριων; κη λεγοντες· η κη ο νομος ταυτα ε λεγει; εν γαρ
 τω Μωσεως νομω γεγραπται· ε φιμωσεις βεν αλωνια. μη των βοων
 μελει τω θεω, η δι ημας παντως λεγει; δι ημας γαρ εγγραφη, κη τα
 εξης. κη ως, &c. The preceding and subsequent part of this Section
 will be found p. 126, & p. 127, this here being what his Lordship alludes
 in “his about it and about it.”

“ less. But some not expounding, are willing to receive Jesus as a prophet, and observe the Law of Moses according to ancient custom, as having in the letter the whole meaning of the spirit.

Is this passage of such a length, either that Origen should ‘ forget *himself*,’ or that he ‘ should think that his *reader* would forget’ what was said but four lines before. This passage only occupies eight half lines in De la Rue’s Ed. Moreover, now that we have the entire section before us, the reader will perceive, that my exposition of it, p. 128, was well founded ; for from hence it appears, that so far from any of the Jews having forsaken their Law, that they had it perpetually in their minds, even in trifling matters ; as in what regarded oxen.

Having merely by accident looked over Dr. Priestley’s Letters to Dr. Geddes, and the Rev. Mr. Howes, I am induced to add the following observations : first premising, that, except Mr. Howes’s ninth Number, I am unacquainted with any thing else which he may have written respecting this controversy ; and not having read Dr. Geddes’s Letters to Dr. Priestley, I am only acquainted with those passages in it, and

of

of its scope, as they are quoted and represented by Dr. Priestley. My motive for not particularly reading those two learned gentlemen's productions upon the present question was, that, from the passages adduced from their writings by Dr. Priestley, it is clear, that these gentlemen's knowledge respecting the ancient heresies does not surpass that of those others whom I have already animadverted upon : and I feared, that if I met with any thing in them which was palpably untenable, and which I affirm to be the case from Dr. Priestley's quotations, I would be sensible of an invincible propensity to set it forth to the public, since I have had the resolution to proceed so far ; which would detain me too long from a work upon which my heart is much fixed on ; as I think, vainly perhaps, that it will tend to be useful to mankind, by leading them towards the knowledge of the truth : I mean that primary and most important truth, Whether God has particularly interfered, since the creation of man, in his concerns : for our future hopes must, in a great measure, depend

pend upon the degree of probability of His having so interfered. To proceed,

Dr. Priestley appears to me to treat so learned a writer as Dr. Geddes with a great deal too much levity; and as if his arguments, in favour of the divinity of Jesus having been the received dogma of the orthodox church, were contemptible: but I will take upon me to affirm, that the ingenious Doctor has not at all answered them; and that, considering his own erroneous notions respecting the ancient heretics, that it was impossible for him to do it. However, let the reader judge.

Dr. Priestley says page 8, 'First, you' (Dr. Geddes) 'call the Nicene Fathers, page 12, "the representatives of the whole Christian church." ' Now, in my opinion, they represented the Christian ' church in no other sense than our House of Lords ' might be said to represent the English nation.' This opinion must be allowed to be very singular. The people, I believe, the Doctor will not dispute, elected at this time their own Bishops; and it is not to be supposed that they would elect persons whose faith differed from that of themselves; and therefore they

they may, with propriety, be said to be representatives of the Christian assemblies. The people of England have nothing to do with the making of Lords.

Dr. Priestley says, 'Those [Nicene] *Fathers* universally held, that the divinity of Christ was greatly inferior to that of the Father; and had its origin in the reason of the Father; which having been first in him as an attribute, afterwards became a person.'

This greatly inferior I positively deny: as to the conversion of an attribute into a person I perceived no proof of it; that is, no passage which explicitly asserts it in the Doctor's writings; which I thought it incumbent on him particularly to point out, as Bishop Horsley has asserted, and I believe more than once, that it was an invention of the Doctor's.

Dr. Geddes says, page 14, as cited by Dr. Priestley, " If the divinity and pre-existence of Christ was not a tenet of primitive Christianity, there must have been a period, prior to the Nicæan Council, when it was accounted an heresy; and when the non-divinity was as universally taught as the sole orthodox doctrine. Be pleased then to point out that period, and prove that it existed, not by negatives, presumptions, and arguments

“ arguments from *improbability*, but by *clear positive*
 “ *testimony*; for, until you do this, I shall always
 “ consider the decision of the Nicæan Synod as an
 “ irrefragable proof that the divinity of our Lord
 “ was an original article of the catholic faith.” I ap-
 prehend that this is solid reasoning.

Dr. Geddes, as quoted by Dr. Priestley, says,
 page 15, “I think you should have endeavoured,
 “ and been able, to shew *when, and by whom, and in*
 “ *what manner*, such an important revolution was
 “ brought about; who was the *first* broacher of
 “ the novel opinion; what *opposition* it met with;
 “ which of the apostolic sees was the *first* to em-
 “ brace it; and by what *wonderful influence* it got
 “ possession of *all* the rest, *without* noise, *without*
 “ resistance, *without* any of those circumstances that
 “ *always* attend the introduction of a *novelty* in
 “ matters of religion, especially when the contradic-
 “ tory of an *established* opinion is attempted to be
 “ introduced.” In answer to these paragraphs, the
 Doctor refers him to his History of early Opinions, as
 if he had not read them, or only looked through it.

Dr. Geddes again says, p. 18, “Is it not strange,
 passing

“ passing strange, that in not one of these assemblies (viz.
 “ about forty councils held after that of Nice), neither
 “ at Alexandria, nor Antioch, nor Cæsarea, nor Sar-
 “ dica, nor Jerusalem, nor Constantinople, nor Sir-
 “ mium, nor Milan, nor Rome, nor Rimini, there
 “ should not be a *single* voice raised in favour of So-
 “ cinianism, a *single* pen employed to defend it, a
 “ *single* authority quoted in its support : and that,
 “ while the whole body of Christians were engaged
 “ in a controversy about two opinions, both *equally*
 “ false, the only *true* dogma should be overlooked,
 “ should be rejected, should be anathematized by
 “ all ! This, I confess, is to me inconceivable—is, in
 “ the nature of things, hardly possible.”

To this very sensible passage, Dr. Priestley again
 refers to his History of Opinions, to convince Dr.
 Geddes of his mistake, which he attributes to the
superficial and *careless* manner in which he first
 perused it : presuming, as he does throughout all his
 writings, that the Sabellians and Ebionites were the
 same sect : but that these were not Christians at all,
 but only simple followers of the *Man*, the *Prophet*,
Jesus, I hope I have clearly made out ; and that they

were not consulted, and probably gave themselves no trouble, about these controversies, I think highly probable: and it may be that they held either opinion, as I do myself, in equal contempt, not even excepting the Sabellian. But that a Sabellian would not be at all suffered in an assembly of the Orthodox, is clearly evident from what Eusebius relates respecting Marcellus; for he says, ‘That Marcellus, fearing
 ‘ to suffer equally with him,’ [Sabellius] ‘discovered
 ‘ a new mode for error, by determining that God,
 ‘ and the Word in him, to be one; and with joy
 ‘ ascribed to him the two names of Father and Son *.’ Yet, according to Eusebius, this did not save him; for he was obliged to blaspheme, βλασφημεῖν, Sabellius.

Dr. Priestley says, ‘You’ [Dr. Geddes] ‘rest this
 ‘ great controversy, as far as it is to be decided
 ‘ by the Scriptures, on *three* or *four* texts, and what
 ‘ appears to be their sense at *first sight* only. But you
 ‘ know, Sir, that the *true* sense of many passages of

* Τα δ' ἴσα αὐτῷ ὑπειδόμενος Μαρκελλὸς παθεῖν, καὶ νωτέρων εἰσευρε-
 τη πλάνῃ μηχανῇ, Θεόν, καὶ τὸν ἐν αὐτῷ Λόγον ἓνα μὲν εἶναι ορί-
 ζόμενος. δύο δ' αὐτῷ πατρός καὶ υἱὸς χαριζόμενος ἐπηγορίας. Euf. con.
 Mare. de Ecc. The. l. i. c. 14.

‘ *Scripture*, as well as of other writings, is by no
 ‘ means what it seems to be at first sight,’ [this,
 with regard to Scripture, I utterly deny: Scripture
 being written for the use of *all* mankind, its
 obvious sense, or what it seems to be at first sight
 must be its true sense] ‘ especially when the language
 ‘ is *figurative*; and that a comparison of them with
 ‘ other passages, is often necessary to explain them’
 [when this happens, it shews that they were not in-
 tended for *all* mankind; few men being capable of
 such a comparison]: ‘ there cannot, therefore, ap-
 ‘ pear, even to yourself, to be any great ground of con-
 ‘ fidence here. And I might well ask you, whether
 ‘ it be not extraordinary, that a doctrine of so great
 ‘ magnitude as that of the divinity of Christ, and
 ‘ which draws after it consequences of so much im-
 ‘ portance in practice, as well as in theory (espe-
 ‘ cially the worshipping of him as the supreme
 ‘ God; and which, at *first sight*, you must acknow-
 ‘ ledge directly militates against the doctrine of the
 ‘ sole divinity of the *one God and Father of all*,
 ‘ expressly called *the God and Father of Jesus Christ*
 ‘ himself), should rest on *three or four* texts, of which

‘ you can only say, that, at *first sight*, they appear to
 ‘ be in your favour.’

This I apprehend to be the pith and marrow of the arguments of the modern Humanists; and by this reasoning, aided by the absurdity of the Trinitarian doctrine, I early became one of their converts. But I actually apprehend, that this reasoning is quite unfolid. For *if* the New Testament be the revealed word of God, it must follow, that every word in it must be true: but this is too manifestly absurd to be admitted by any scholar! But suppose I admit, with Dr. Priestley, that a considerable portion of it may be discarded, and that the writers may even have erred in delivering their accounts, will he therefore assert that Jesus himself could err, particularly when speaking respecting the object of his commission? Surely this cannot be maintained. Well, what does Jesus say—‘ I and my Father are one:’ There does not appear to me to be any figure in this expression. Dr. Priestley, &c. say there is; for he only means by it, that he came as an ambassador, and that like the representatives of *earthly* Kings, whatever he did was the same thing as if God himself did it;
 for

for in this respect they might be deemed as one. To justify this interpretation, one would think that there was in the preceding part of Jesus's discourse some mention of *ambassadorial* power; but there is no such thing: his language throughout plainly intimates his having self-power, and an indiscriptable unity with the Father. John, ch. x. ver. 28 and 29, he says, ' And *I* give unto them eternal life, and ' they shall never perish, neither shall any pluck ' them out of *my* hand. My Father which gave' [them] ' me is greater than all, and none is able to ' pluck' [them] ' out of my Father's hand. I and ' my Father are one.' But how did the Jews understand these words? for it may be supposed, that they were as good judges of the meaning and scope of Jesus's language as any modern Doctor. ' Then ' the Jews took up stones again to stone him. Jesus ' answered them, Many good works have I shewed ' you from my Father; for which of those works do ' ye stone me.' The Jews answered him, saying, ' For ' a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy, ' and because that thou, being a man, makest thy- ' self God.' This, I apprehend, settles the meaning of

of 'I and my Father are one.' Moreover, how were those words understood by the earliest Fathers? Precisely as the Jews understood them. I speak positively with respect to Tertullian and Chrysostom; and defy any Humanist to shew that they were otherwise understood, but particularly as the Humanists now understand them, by any Father before the fourth century. Perhaps it will be affirmed, that Paul of Samosate, who believed Jesus to have been a mere man, and to have been born at Nazareth, must have understood this passage as the modern Humanists do: but this by no means follows. Might not Paul have been one of the *Alogi*, who received not the Gospel of John, because of its little resemblance with the other Gospels? It is evident, that as he believed (as we are assured by Athanasius) that Jesus was born at *Nazareth*, that he did *not* believe that he was born at *Bethlem*, notwithstanding all that Matthew has written upon that head. Is not this a more probable supposition, than that he put such violence upon plain words? I therefore assert, that he who believes that Jesus pronounced these words, must admit that he was one with the Father;

or

or, that what he said was *not* true. This passage, but particularly the prefatory verses of this Gospel, prove demonstrably the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son. I am satisfied the enforcing this doctrine was a main object with the writer of it. Here I cannot avoid cautioning young persons against too implicitly receiving the expositions of modern expositors, of any persuasion: for there being scarcely a passage in the New Testament which has not given rise to a controversy, writers, according to their respective biases, expound, and in like manner translate. It may be, that some trifling, unimportant passages *might* be better translated, and that some of them *might* be rendered into more modern English; but these are mere trifles, when, in return, important passages may be *un-truly* rendered. We may understand Greek and Hebrew better now than they were understood 200 or 300 years ago; but that is of little consequence, when it is considered, that our New Testament was early translated into Latin by persons who could *speak*, as well as write, both languages; and with such guides in a man's hands, with a very moderate share of Greek, he can scarcely

ly

ly err in truly rendering the Greek. And our early translators, not having been educated, I may say, in the school of controversy, had nothing to bias their judgments, but simply to render the original. What I have said here equally applies to the Old Testament; for Christian writers, having no doubt but that Jesus was the Messiah, have had their judgments greatly warped by this notion. However, it is to be hoped that the learned Dr. Geddes will give us, above all, a *literal* translation of that work; discarding all modern terms of art, which, except to scholars, are not significative. Were the words Christ, Church, Bishop, &c. rendered in our translation by the significative terms of, the anointed, the assembly, the overseer, the people would not be a tenth part so much prejudiced in their favour as they now are every where. The above terms are utterly incomprehensible to the generality; and we all know the attachment of the vulgar to mysteries, or to what they do not understand. What I have said here respecting John x. 30. may be affirmed with regard to some other texts. The texts alluded to by Dr. Geddes are well known. Let
the

the Unitarians support their interpretations of them by shewing, that they were *absolutely* understood in the same manner in which they explain them by a *single* Father of the Church, for the three first centuries after Christ: till this is shown *absolutely*, and not by arguments drawn from *probability*, their interpretations ought not to be attended to. Let Dr. Priestley, or his friend Mr. Lindsey*, produce a passage
in

* I have just perused the 2d chapter of this very worthy gentleman's Second Address to the Students of Oxford and Cambridge, and cannot help esteeming it a complete refutation of the Unitarians or Humanists: for in this chapter the author adduces the testimony of *one* of the apostolic Fathers, Barnabas, the companion of Holy Paul, and of *four* primitive Fathers, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Tertullian, who all, according to him, flourished in the second century of the Christian æra, besides Eusebius, the learned Bishop of Cæsarea, who all expressly teach the pre-existence and divinity of Jesus Christ. Now, did such persons really exist, and were they as truly learned, and as honest, as they are represented by this writer, what evidence can be adduced at all to be compared to them among the primitive Christians to shew that the Humanist sentiment had been that which had been taught by Jesus Christ and his Apostles. This argument is still farther strengthened, since it is well known that among the primitive Christians it does not appear that this doctrine met with any opposition; nay, on the contrary, if these writers are supposed to copy one another, and to have been in succession to one another for nearly 200 years, as Mr. L. supposes, it is such a confirmation of the truth of the doctrine of the pre-existence and divinity of Christ having been the true Christian doctrine, that to

in which it is said of any other prophet, for such only they deem Jesus Christ, that 'he came forth from the

the
give any credit to the assertions of writers, however learned, however ingenious, however honest, who teach the contrary, can only be ascribed to the deepest prepossession and partiality. To me the testimony of those writers are of no consequence; as, except Tertullian, who flourished towards the latter end of the second century, and Eusebius in the beginning of the fourth; the first of whom taught the true catholic doctrine of his time inasmuch as regarded the Trinity, the latter being a concealed Arian; the four others, I scruple not to affirm, from their being acquainted with the *blasphemers* of Christ, which was the *characteristic* of the *Sabellians*, must have been acquainted with that heresy; and of course have lived *after* the middle of the third century; and therefore the writings which pass under their names must be spurious productions of this century, and of no authority.

The worthy author has also adduced and considered those texts of the New Testament which the Catholics affirm teach the divinity and pre-existence of Christ; but which he, with other Humanists, understands in a very different light, interpreting them in a very extraordinary and far-fetched manner indeed! However, as every person is fond of his own mode of interpreting, let Mr. Lindsey, or any other Humanist, shew, that these texts were *ever* understood in the same manner during the first *ten* centuries of Christianity by any one Catholic writer: if he cannot do this, it follows, either that the Catholic faith is the true Christian doctrine, or that it is utterly false; that is, that the Christian religion is a mere human imposition. I apprehend that the Unitarians should speak out, and say, 'We, who live 1700 years after certain books were composed, in which are contained the fundamental truths of the Christian faith, profess, that we, in consequence of the superior lights arising from modern criticism, understand those writings far better than the people who wrote and spoke the same language:' or let them affirm that the
ancient

the Father *into* the world ;' and then it may be doubted whether the pre-existence of Jesus be taught in the New Testament or not.

The

ancient Fathers were a set of men who imposed on the world. For my part, I shall ever contend, that the Greeks and Latins understood their own languages better than any moderns whatsoever. If this be admitted, what use is there in adducing the authority of Castalio, Grotius, &c.; they are no authority at all, were they a hundred times more learned, unless supported by the Ancients.

This learned gentleman also asserts, that the Nazarenes and Ebionites were Christians. I could wish he would point out a passage from one of the Ancients who affirms it: the assertion till that is done, should be disregarded.

Though this gentleman is esteemed, I apprehend, the most temperate of the Humanist writers, yet he has not scrupled to tax Justin with 'delusion' and 'ignorance of the language of the Scripture,' of his making Christ a second God being 'a fiction of a warm fancy:' yet notwithstanding these charges, and his not crediting Justin's assertion, that 'God had imparted to him the *gift* [or extraordinary favour] of understanding the Scriptures,' yet still he holds him to be a person of 'unquestioned probity,' and a 'good man.' As for myself, being convinced that no man could make this claim without having an absolute knowledge of the certainty of it, and agreeing with Mr. Lindsey that he had no *such gift*, I cannot avoid esteeming him a base impostor; even worse than Mahomet, whose towering ambition must certainly plead in excuse with us poor mortals.

Mr. Lindsey mentions, p. 144, that the heresy of the Docetæ soon died away. It nevertheless subsisted to the middle of the 6th century, as we learn from Justinian.

He also observes that Praxeas was an Unitarian, that is a Humanist; in

The Humanists inform us, that the Father is God, and that the Holy Ghost is God, or his attri-

like manner Marcellus, and, I presume, with Dr. Priestley, Sabellius : and yet these three held very different notions respecting the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Praxeas denied the latter altogether, and affirmed the Father and Son to be *one* Subsistence, and *one* Person under two appellations—Sabellius, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were *one* Subsistence, and *one* Person, under three appellations—Marcellus that they were only one Subsistence but three Persons : his error consisted in denying that they were each of them *ενυποστατος*, that is, having a distinct Subsistence. The terms *Subsistence* and *ενυποστατος* will be explained in the 2d Part.

The passage taken from Eusebius, n. p. 55, might have been more accurately rendered. Its true meaning is this, that Marcellus maintained that “ * the Son had no being, nor existence, nor ever at all had personality and subsistence with God before he was born of a Virgin. Saying, that he was only the Logos, or reason ; being of the *same nature* with God, co-existing and united with him, from all eternity, just as reason in man : for he makes use of this very example.” Does not the latter sentence seem to imply that he was the first who did so. If this be allowed, what becomes of Dr. Priestley’s, &c. arguments in support of the antiquity of this mode of interpretation, or of the Logos being an attribute of God ? I have rendered *υπαρχει* as equivalent to having personality and subsistence, which I shall prove, in the 2d Part, to be its true meaning : whereas Mr. L. makes it only synonymous with *ειναι* in the beginning of the sentence, and therefore may be said to be a tautology : *συμφυα τω θεω* is rendered by him *an attribute of the Deity*, which it does not mean ; it is obviously, of the *same nature*, or connatural ; and strongly militates against the Unitarian notion.

These few remarks, dictated by a love of truth, I am sure will be taken in good part by the worthy author, whose sufferings in that cause should endear it to him.

* *Μητε ειναι*, &c. Euf. ap. Colón. 1688, contra Marcell.

bute; if then Jesus be only a mere man, how comes it that he thrusts himself, in the following passage, betwixt God and God, or God and his attribute, as they say, ‘Go ye and baptize all nations in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’ This I apprehend, a person like Jesus, who was conscious of the divine perfections, and the nothingness, in comparison, of human *nature*, would not be capable of, were he only a man. For this last observation I am indebted to Bishop Horsley’s Scotch correspondent, Dr. Robert Hamilton. In my apprehension the Humanists, to maintain their system, should do as the Manichees; that is, affirm that the books of the New Testament were not written by those persons whose names they bear, but by other persons who were themselves ignorant, or who had no precise knowledge, of the transactions which they record; and that, therefore, they are at liberty to receive those parts of the New Testament, which to them appear to do him honour, and to discard the rest.

I proceed to Dr. Priestley’s Letters to the Candidates for Orders, in which he animadverts upon some positions of Mr. Howes.

The

The Doctor, page 80, says, 'In the title-page of
 ' his work, he,' Mr. Howes, ' says,' "No such
 " Christians [Humanists] ever existed, except in
 ' Utopia, during the *two first* centuries, as those
 ' whom Dr. Priestley calls Ancient Unitarians;
 " that is, who were not believers in the divinity
 " of Christ, *in some* mode or other." This, the
 Doctor thinks,] is a very *extravagant* assertion: but
 it is in fact a true one, unless he can shew that the
 Ebionites were Christians.

As to the disputed passage of Tertullian, De Carne
 Christi, sect. 14, it is obviously an interpolation;
 as is also every other passage in which the word
 Ebion occurs, in the genuine works of this au-
 thor: for, besides that all such passages can be taken
 away, without at all injuring the sense of the au-
 thor, which *alone* should render them *suspected*, yet,
 if what he says of Ebion in these passages were true,
 namely, that his opinion was heretical, it would con-
 tradict, what he himself admits in his answer to Prax-
 eas, that they formed the majority of the assemblies
 of the followers of Jesus. V. Pre. Disq. p. 54, n. 29.
 as also what Origen has written respecting the ne-
 cessity

cessity of preaching a *corporeal* gospel to the majority of the believers of Jesus : V. Pre. Disq. p. 59. n. 30. for, as the majority *only* believed in the humanity of Jesus, was this opinion heretical, they would of course have been expelled Christian assemblies. Moreover how came Tertullian to know, that the first propounder of this sect was called *Ebion*, and that from him the *Ebionites* derived their appellation. Origen, who lived shortly after Tertullian, derives it from the word *Ebjonim*, which in Hebrew means *poor* ; which he would not have done, had there been any grounds for Tertullian's notion : and this opinion is, moreover, I apprehend, universally received by the learned.

Before I proceed farther, I shall make a single observation upon Mr. David Levi's Letters to Dr. Priestley. This ingenious writer affirms that the Doctor is not a Christian ; but not like others who *assert*, he attempts to prove it. But surely Mr. Levi must know, that in the *first* centuries of Christianity, many who entertained far bolder notions than Dr. Priestley respecting both the Old and New Testaments, ceased not however to call themselves Christians,

ans, and to be allowed by the Orthodox to have been *such*, though *Heretics*. Paul of Samosate held Jesus to be the Christ, but still to have been but a *mere* man, and consequently must have rejected the two first chapters of Matthew, and of Luke; yet the Paulians were acknowledged to be Christians: even Athanasius apologizes for those who entertained such *low* opinions of Christ. The Manichees received neither the New nor Old Testament, yet still they were esteemed *Christians*. St. Augustine was of this sect, till towards his 30th year. I own it gives me pain, when I attribute to this cause, though perhaps erroneously, Dr. Priestley's not answering Mr. Levi's Second Letters, which certainly have made an impression on persons whom Dr. Priestley himself would admit to be learned men. As the Doctor has committed Christianity, by provoking the Jews to a controversy, I apprehend that no private motive whatsoever, should influence him from continuing a controversy, of which he himself was the cause; and in which many persons (Christians) think that he and Christianity have the worst of the argument. I apprehend, if the cause I have assigned be the *true* cause,

that

that he is the more reprehensible; for however offended he may justly feel himself to be, by having his Christianity doubted, notwithstanding his frequent declarations to the contrary (and of which I have no more doubt than I have of my own existence), yet he should not be so nice upon this head, I apprehend, when he considers, that, though Mr. Gibbon, in two places, perhaps more, ranks himself with Christians, yet he scruples not to pronounce him an infidel*, or of indirectly giving him the lie: and the Doctor must know, that what Mr. Gibbon has men-

* It is no apology for the Doctor to say, that Mr. Gibbon's writings evidently tend to sap the foundations of Christianity. Many persons to my knowledge think the Doctor's own writings have as strong a tendency the same way, and have had an equal effect. For my part I believe that the object of both these ingenious writers, with respect to Christianity, was the same. The one openly exposes, the other artfully lays open, its absurdities, in order to awake and make mankind sensible of the gross corruptions of the religion of Jesus; and it may be, that the difference between them in opinion is not greater than between the Bishop of St. David and the ingenious Doctor. For my part it is my intention to lay the axe to the root of the evil, by shewing that Christianity itself is a human imposture, moulded upon the object of Jesus's mission. Throughout the entire discussion, that LAW, which I firmly believe was delivered unto the Israelites from God through Moses, shall be my polar star, and which, I trust, I can prove must have been so given.

* N n

tioned

tioned respecting Christianity in the main, had been urged before by the Manichees against the Orthodox; yet the Manichees are allowed by his favourite Lardner, and I presume, by another of his favourites, Beaufobre, to have been Christians. For my part I know nothing of Mr. Gibbon. To my knowledge I never saw him, but I am informed by those who do know him, that he is a worthy and an honest man; and as such I will take his word, and look upon him as a Christian, though even the bench of Bishops should join with his Lordship of St. David's, and Dr. Priestley, in pronouncing him an Infidel.

I shall take leave of the Bishop of St. David's, with considering what his Lordship has said respecting the 'wretched' Epiphanius; who, however wretched a writer his Lordship may think him, was not held in so low an estimation by his contemporaries, or immediate successors: and though his Lordship imputes to him 'the unwilling confession of a base accuser,' and more equivocation than to the lying, perjured Origen; yet he was deemed by them a person of great truth and *naïveté* of character; virtues which are usually associated with credulity. However,

ever, it was not convenient to his Lordship to point out these good qualities of the holy Father, lest any testimony of his should have, with unprejudiced persons, so much weight as to overthrow his Lordship's groundless theory. His Lordship charges Dr. Priestley with *forgery*, for 'torturing from their true meaning' the words of Epiphanius in support of what he had asserted, that *as to any Nazarenes who believed that Christ was any thing more than a man he found no trace in history*: in reply to which modest affirmation, his Lordship says, that he was more unfortunate in his researches than Hugo Grotius, Vossius, Spencer, and Huetius, as they maintained the high orthodoxy of the Nazarenes. But suppose they held this notion; upon what authority did they hold it? Let his Lordship, who is so conversant in ancient and modern learning, point out ONE passage which *explicitly* affirms it; for as to his Lordship's inferences, they can only be swallowed by his admirers.

Again, for Dr. Priestley's saying that Epiphanius abandoned his dubiety respecting the Nazarenes having held the Miraculous Conception or not; by ascribing to them the same opinions as to the Ebi-

onites, namely, that Jesus was a mere man; he is charged by his Lordship with ‘perverseness’ in rendering, and ‘an artful substitution of an inference of his own for the words of the author.’ Such charges must be deemed, except by professed Polemics, to be so ungentlemanlike, so gross, and so shocking, as scarcely to be credited by ordinary readers. But what will such persons think, should they find that these charges are groundless; and, if this can be shewn against his Lordship, what epithet ought to be applied to himself, for such gross treatment of a character by many highly, and I am sure, deservedly esteemed, I shall leave to *Polemics* to determine. But, should it farther appear, that his Lordship is guilty of the very charges he imputes to his adversary, what will unprejudiced readers infer: I apprehend nothing favourable to a religion which permits such foul defamation in its Principals.

The first remark I shall make, is, that Doctor Priestley, in his inferences from Epiphanius, is supported by the *learned* Petavius, a character which I suspect Bishop Horsley will not retain a century and a half: this, one might think, should deter his Lordship from
 using

using so harsh a term as *false* to any exposition supported by so able a scholar: and who, being dead nearly a century and a half, could have no view in this passage of falsely rendering his author. But what will appear still more extraordinary is, that his Lordship has *followed* Petavius, where he says *more* than his author; because, forsooth, favouring his own opinion, as will presently appear.

Epiphanius, in his History of Heresies, has numbered them. After the Gnostics, who are the 26th, come the Carpocratians, whom he affirms to have held that Jesus Christ was a mere man. In No. 28, of the Cerinthians, he says, 'that they thought in *like* manner concerning Jesus Christ. No. 29 is allotted to the Nazarenes, who he makes to spring up in Egypt when Mark the Evangelist went to preach the Gospel there, which is nearly a *hundred* years prior to the time that his Lordship allows them to have sprung up. He, moreover, says, that in every thing they thought with the Jews, except that they believed in Christ—and with the Christians, except holding themselves bound by the prescriptions of the Law of Moses. "But," says he, "concerning Christ I cannot say whether,

“ whether, impelled by the impiety of Cerinthus and
 “ Merinthus, whom we have before mentioned [in
 “ No. 28], they believe him to be a mere man, or, as
 “ the truth is, confess him to be born of the Virgin
 “ Mary by the Holy Spirit.” This passage is thus rendered by his Lordship, Tracts, p. 143, “ Concerning
 “ Christ, says Epiphanius, I cannot say *with certainty*,”
 &c. Now, for this ‘with certainty,’ his Lordship has no other authority except Petavius, who has inserted the word *certo* in his exposition, without having any term equivalent to it in his author; and in which he is *literally* followed by his Lordship. In No. 30 he treats of the Ebionites, who, he says, in the *first* line, thought like things with these [Nazarenes]. Now, as there is no dispute about the Ebionites holding Christ to have been a mere man, it is clear, that by a term of such latitude as *ομοια*, *like things*, that Epiphanius meant to be understood, that with regard to all matters of *importance* (and such no doubt he held the divinity of Christ) the Ebionites and Nazarenes entertained the same opinions. Was not Dr. Priestley then justified in saying, that his doubt concerning the Nazarenes holding the Miraculous Conception in

No. 29, was abandoned in No. 31; or to make use of the Doctor's own expression, 'was afterwards abandoned.' But because the Doctor quotes Epiphanius for saying, "but I do not know whether they [Nazarenes] held "the Miraculous Conception or not;" instead of "their "believing him [Christ] to be a mere man, or not," which phrases are precisely equivalent, he is charged 'with perverseness of translation,' and 'an artful substitution of an inference of his own from the author's words, for the words of the author.' But I now trust that the candid reader, in this instance at least, will acquit the ingenious Doctor.

What his Lordship says in the 13th section of his 6th letter, concerning the term *γῶμη*, as signifying *sentiment*, is absurd, and can only impose on readers of romances. Doctor Priestley renders it *by opinion*: But Petavius has more justly rendered it by *dogmata*, or religious tenets.

I shall now proceed to the 2d Section, of what Epiphanius has said concerning the Nazarenes. I shall follow his Lordship's example in giving two expositions of it; one of his Lordship's, with *his additions* marked in Italics, which some, perhaps, might think,
from

from their importance, might be deemed ‘an artful substitution of an inference of his own from the author’s words, for the words of the author;’ *at least* as much so as Doctor Priestley’s mode of rendering just considered. The other exposition will not be found to be quite so elegant; but, perhaps, it may be found more agreeable to the original, which I give without stops, thinking it the fairest way, observing that my rendering is pointed agreeably to Petavius. Upon this head his Lordship is curiously nice: for when he is not satisfied with his author, he says that he ‘has sacrificed the Syntax;’ this he affirms even with regard to the great Athanasius. At other times his author is not properly stopped, and accordingly he alters the punctuation so as to make him speak nonsense, if he cannot be made to speak in his own favour: But, in the passage in question, his Lordship not only stops his author differently from the learned Petavius, whom Dr. Priestley has followed, and for which he is blamed by his Lordship; but he has even had the *modesty* to insert a considerable parenthesis, in order that this ‘wretched’ Epiphanius’s testimony may not be adduced against him: but all this

‘management’

management won't do ; even according to his Lordship's exposition his testimony shall be adduced against him. But perhaps it will not be irrelevant to observe, that a person of poor abilities, indeed, might be a match for all the Aristotles and Lockes that ever existed, if allowed such liberties : it may be added, that when a person of his Lordship's abilities has recourse to such 'arts', it is in fact a giving up of the point in question. Euphronius then says

Dr.

Bishop HORSLEY.

For this Ebion was contemporary with these, and he sets out *from the same principles* with them (but first of all he asserted, that Christ was begotten of the commerce and seed of a man, namely Joseph) as hath been already related by us. For agreeing with other [heretics] in all things [else] he differed in this single point, in that he adhered to the Judaic law with respect to the observation of the sabbaths, and to circumcision, and to all other things which are common to the rites of the Jews and the Samaritans. And besides, he is punctual in many things, not regarded by the Jews, in conformity with the Samaritans.

Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Εβίων συγχρονὸς μὲν
τῶν ὑπερχέν ἀπ' αὐτῶν δὲ συν-
αὐτοῖς οὐραῖαι τὰ πρῶτα δὲ ἐκ
παράφρεως καὶ σπαρμαίως αἰδρός
τῆς τε Ἰωσήφ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενε-
νήσθαι εἰπεν ὡς καὶ νῦν ἡμεῖς προ-
εἰρήσῃ οἱ τὰ ἴσα τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐν
ἀπασὶ φροσὶν ἐν τῷ μόνῳ διεφε-
ρῆτο ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῶ Ἰουδαίῳ
προσανεχέειν, καὶ σαββατισμὸν καὶ
καὶ τὴν περιτομὴν καὶ καὶ τὰ
ἀλλὰ πάντα ὁσαυτὲς παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις
καὶ Σαμαρείταις ἐπιτελεῖται ἐν δὲ
πλείῳ ἤτοι παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων
ὁμοίως τοῖς Σαμαρείταις διαπρατ-
τεῖται.

Mr. HAMILTON.

For this Ebion was contemporary with these [Nazarenes] and with these [Nazarenes] came forth from them, [Cerinthians and Carpecrations], and first he said that Christ was begotten of the commerce and seed of a man, namely Joseph; and as it was already mentioned by us, that in all things he thought alike with the others [Nazarenes], in this only he differed, in adhering to the law of Judaism, with regard to the sabbath, and to the circumcision, and to all other things in like manner as observed by the Jews and Samaritans. Moreover, contrary to the Jews, he practises more things in like manner with the Samaritans.

Among his Lordship's additions the reader will perceive 'from the same principles.' Now what common or *same* principle was entertained by Ebion and these, namely the Carpocratians, Cerinthians, and Nazarenes, except that Jesus Christ was a mere man: if they held any other common principle I hope his Lordship will point it out, for it has escaped me: but, as this is above his Lordship's abilities, it follows then, that according to his Lordship's exposition, that the Nazarenes and Ebionites held the same opinion of Christ, namely, that he was a mere man. Another addition of his Lordship's is *of all*: this I affirm to be 'an artful substitution of an inference of his own from the Author's words, for the words of the Author'

I have now done with his Lordship; and should He, or any on his behalf, or the other gentlemen whom I have criticised think fit to reply concerning any of my assertions respecting the opinions of the Antients, I here premise, that in support of an opposite opinion, I shall hold it as a giving up of the question upon their side, their adducing the authority of any modern in support of what they advance upon such a point; for as I have observed in my preface, the opinions of the Antients are not to be gathered from the Moderns who do not understand

derstand their language, as I shall prove beyond the power of cavil in my 2d. part; but from the language of the Antients themselves truly understood, and as it was understood by themselves.

From these sheets it very clearly appears, that the Nazarenes and the Ebionites held the same sentiment concerning Jesus, as the *believing* Hebrews, namely, that he was an upright Man without any union of deity : and that he was *not* the promised Messiah. Now as the first followers of Jesus were nick-named, by the unbelieving Hebrews, *Nazarenes*, as being the followers of a Man of mean parentage, an inhabitant of the village of Nazareth : and as they are allowed by the Christian Fathers themselves, together with their *primitive nickname among the unbelieving Hebrews*, to have retained their *primitive faith without any adulteration*, can it reasonably be doubted, but that this faith is the true faith, which should be embraced by all lovers of truth, as being that which was delivered by Jesus to his Apostles, and by them taught to the rest of mankind. This follows even from the principles of the Fathers themselves, who, with great propriety, maintained against the propounders of Heresies continually springing
up

up, that that which was novel, must necessarily be false ; and of course that that sentiment which was entertained by the primitive or first followers must be the true faith. And what this faith was, both with regard to belief and practice is evident from the controversy between Jerome and Augustine lately laid before the readers. Such *poor* believers who founded upon the promises of the Mosaic law their future expectations were nick-named by the Christians, *Ebionites*, thus poorly punning upon the term *Ebion* which in Hebrew means poor : because, forsooth, setting at nought the splendid promises held forth in the New Testament, esteeming it a spurious production, they relied solely in this respect upon those held forth in the law of Moses. Therefore, if persons entertaining the same religious notions are entitled to the *same* appellation, doubtlessly the Nazarenes and Ebionites come within this predicament. If this then be indisputable, as I trust it is, it follows, that the Nazarenes and Ebionites were the *same* sect under different appellations, the first being their *nickname* among the unbelieving Jews, the latter among the Christians, the contrary of which has been asserted by the *learned* Dr. Horsley and a crowd of Moderns. And that they were not Christians as Dr. Priestley *presumes* is evident,

evident, independently of the testimony of Athanasus* that they did not believe that the CHRIST HAD AT ALL COME, from their never having been thus designated by the Antients.

It farther appears from these sheets, that there were in the second and third centuries two sorts of believers in Jesus Christ: one of which would not worship him, the other sort were not so scrupulous. The ecclesiastical order was it seems chiefly composed of these last. It cannot be doubted but that among the Laity also there were many of the same way of thinking. But that the majority of the followers of Jesus when assembled in their congregations were of the first sort cannot be justly disputed, seeing that the testimony of Tertullian and Origen is express against the majority permitting prayers to be offered except to the one God, and are, therefore, called by Origen Corporeal Believers see preliminary disquisition p. 54, n. 29, and p. 56, n. 30.

What these Fathers say upon this head clearly evinces, were there other proofs wanting, that the Epistle ascribed to Pliny is spurious: for in it he affirms that the followers of Jesus addressed Him at their meetings as though he were a God: but from Origen's testimony it is clear, that

that such a mode of addressing Him did not take place among his followers at their religious meetings, for upwards of a century after Pliny. This single argument must be allowed to be sufficient to evince the spuriousness of this celebrated Epistle.

Farther, that Arius having denied the animus in Jesus Christ was *not a novelty* appears clearly evident from its not being noticed by his adversaries among his errors, and that He held the anima, to have been a component part of Jesus Christ we have the *explicit* testimony of the accurate Marius Mercator. *Qua praesumpta incerta tanquam certa et Scripturis minime expressa opinio, Apollinarem Laodiceum et postea Arianos, (non autem ipsum Arium) et Eunomium quoque, et ultimum Macedonium forte decipit, ut hinc sentirent et pronuntiarent, Christum Dei filium corpus tantum hominis, non etiam animam suscepisse; pro anima autem Dei filium, Verbum Patris in illo suscepto corpore habitasse.* Which may be thus rendered. “ Which opinion [that the angels in the Old Testament had assumed inanimated bodies only] “ though doubtful, and not at “ all determined in scripture, being taken up as certain, by “ chance imposed on Apollinaris of Laodicea, and afterwards the Arians (but not Arius himself) and Eunomius “ also,

“ also, and finally Macedonius, that they should thence
“ think and affirm, that Christ the Son of God, took up
“ only the body of a man, but not the animus ; but that the
“ Son of God, the Word of the Father, inhabited in that
“ taken-up body in the stead of the anima.”



F I N I S.

IMPORTANT PASSAGES

QUOTED FROM

The Ancients in this Work.

To enable the Reader immediately to recollect what he wants, the beginning of each passage is recited or its subject mentioned.

P R E F A C E.

M ARIUS Mercator, Ebion, a Stoic Philosopher	Page 13
The Author of Predestinatus, Ebionæans confuted by Luke at Antioch.	14

PRELIMINARY DISQUISITION.

Athanasius, Christ not at all Come	8
ib. The <i>then Jews</i>	10
ib. ib.	16
ib. Test of Heresy	52
Augustine, Gnostics not Blaphemers	67
ib. Concerning Photinus	78
Clemens Al. Testimony to Mark's Gospel	24
Cyprian. Baptism	41
Epiphanius. Ebionites rejected the New Testament	19
	ib.

	Page
ib. Nazarenes, ib.	20
Eusebius. Origen's character	2
ib. Ebionites rejected the New Testament	19
ib. Antiquity of the Ebionites	62
Fauftus. The Jews rejected the New Testament	25
ib. New Testament not written by the Apostles	33
Firmilian. No Gnostics in the Apostolic Age	39
ib. No Communion between Gnostics and Catholics	40
Hilary. Difficulties of the Catholics	49
ib. Test of Heresy.	51
Jerome. Gospels interpolated	22
ib. Mark wrote a short Gospel	ib.
ib. Test of Heresy	51
ib. Heretics expelled	53
Justin Martyr, proves the <i>then Jews</i> of Athanasius to have been believing Jews	13
ib. But others who teach to Blaspheme	70
ib. And there are some who confess Christ to have been of our Race	74
Nestorius. Concerning Photinus	78
Novatus. Inferiority of the Son	47
Origen. Ebionites	4
ib. Double Ebionites	5
ib. Faith of the Jewish believers	7
ib. Inferiority of the Son. Not to pray to Christ	46
ib. Spiritual and Corporeal Believers	56
Socrates. Sabellians why Blasphemers	66
ib. Concerning Photinus	78
Sulpicius Severus, ib.	79
	Ter-

Tertullian. Christians called Nazarenes	-	Page 27
ib. Forasmuch as some unguarded People, &c.		53
Vincentius Lirinensis, concerning Photinus	-	79

STRICTURES.

Athanasius. Difficulty of comprehending Orthodoxy		144
ib. Apologizes for the Humanists	-	145
Basil's Notion of Orthodoxy	-	140
ib. Concerning Marcellus	- -	161
Chrysostom. Son of God infers not Deity		96
Cosmas. Testimony concerning the Books of the New Testament	- -	30
Cyprian. Judæi not necessarily Hebrews		242
Epiphanius. Concerning the Nazarenes	-	104
Eusebius. Testimony concerning the Books of the New Testament	- -	28
ib. Concerning Marcellus	- -	268
Fulgentius. Notion of Orthodoxy	-	140
Gregory Naz. ib.	- -	141
Jerome. Lactantius denied the Subsistency of the Holy Spirit	- - -	110
ib. Many the same.	- -	111
ib. Quid dicam de Hebionitis	-	191
ib. Citation from Isaiah	- -	212
ib. Ebion and the Jews who believed, agreed that the Law of Moses was to be observed.	-	227
Josephus. Greeks and Romans unversed in the Jewish Language, and vice versa	-	7
Justin M. Nazarene, Notion of the Incarnation		246
Marius Mercator, Arius held the Anima	-	287
Origen,		

	Page
Origen. What the Jewish believers thought of Jesus	104
ib. Celsus's Ignorance	126
ib. ib.	127, 129, 245
ib. Alma.	137
Tertullian. Simplicēs & Idiotæ	228
Theodoret. What the Hebrews thought concerning Jesus	105
ib. Artemas's Notion concerning the Maker of the World	109
ib. Concerning Marcellus	159
ib. Concerning Ebion, The Nazarenes Jews	244
Sundry Passages concerning the Anima	165, 184



CORRECTIONS and ERRATA.

PRELIMINARY DISQUISITION.

Page	Line	
5	3	Read <i>abided</i> .
6	10	r. <i>as it is</i> .
9	last	r. the Christ was to be a mere man, only that he was to come, &c.
17	15	Jews, r. Jewish believers
23	2	r. think it.
27		margin, r. 200.
29	15	the parenthesis after <i>may</i>) instead of after <i>God</i> .
30	18	they, r. he.
38	14	r. one of Stephanus, bishop of Rome.
46	last	Jesus, r. Christ.
52	8	to r. on.
71	last	word, dele
78	4	Marius Mercator r. Nestorius

STRICTURES.

8	8	Christus, r. Chrestus
46	9	me r. one
54	19	on, r. or
56	18	or any other, dele
66	7	Catholics, r. read Papists.
78	13	r. similar passage—last line, second not r. nor
119	9	r. believed—line 14, vending, r. vending as
150		pen. geographical, r. biographical
161	5	personality, r. subsistence
165	1	r. a Synod of Rome, A. D. 370
174	2	Christ, r. Jesus
176	8	but r. only
178	last	r. 362.
210	pen.	aura, r. eum.
216	19	r. excess
218	7	ut r. et.
231	1	r. appellat.
234	13	is r. are
241	20	r. Father
282	3	c. read Carpocratians

Corrections and Errata in Notes to Disquisition.

- Page
- 2 pen. read Euf. H. E. l. 6, c. iii. p. 166.
- 13 Ap. i. 85, A. Lard. v. ii. p. 122, form. ed. i. 269.
- 19 after Hær. add 30, sect. i.
- 22 pen. r. Hier.
- 24 line 1. r. καὶ, after δε. r. εσχκεναι—l. 6. r. επιγοντα—
ib. r. μητε κωλυσαι.—l. 8, r. διδλωται.—pen. dele
p. 216.
- 46 after τυχοντων put
- 56 l. 6. after περι read αυτη. pen. after επανελθοντος read
απο τε σεσαρκωθαι.
—l. 10, after ερωντες, r. τε της.
- 62 l. 2. r. αποκαλυντες.—l. 3, r. σωτηρος.

Corrections and Errata in Notes to the Strictures.

- 105 pen. r. H. F. l. 2. c. iii.
- 126 l. 3. to read τα.
- 145 pen. ones, read clauses.
- 166 note omitted.

Μεγαλειοτερα μεν εν πασης ανθρωπεις διδασκαλιας, φαινεται τα ημετερα
δια τειλο λογικον το ολον [δια το λογικον ολον] τον φανειλα δι ημας
χριστον γεγονεναι κη σωμα κη λογον κη ψυχην. Apol. ii. p. 123.

- 167 1st. note, read c. 32. 2d. note, read remissam
- 169 after συγγινομεν read τω ανθρωπω—1st. reference, p. 250.
- 172 antp. read sect. 3.
- 227 line 2. read decernens.
- 231 line 1, read appellat.
- 246 read μωρον.
- 287 read quæ.

POSTSCRIPT. I forgot to observe, that the parenthesis introduced by Bishop Horsley, p. 282, in the passage from Epiphanius, if taken away, entirely destroys the Sense, which shews that it cannot be a Parenthesis, for this may be always taken away without injuring the Sense.



Just Published,

BY THE AUTHOR,

TWO LETTERS to the PEOPLE of ENGLAND,
upon the PRESENT CRISIS, containing a New System
of Finance. Price 6d. each.

A NEW PLAN of PARLIAMENTARY REFORM, 6d.

An Attempt to Explain the Terms, Democracy, Aristocracy,
Oligarchy, Monarchy, and Despotism, 6d.

IN THE PRESS, PART II. of this Work,

Which will contain STRICTURES upon Dr. PRIESTLEY'S
New History of the Christian Church; and upon what Mr.
GIBBON has advanced concerning Christianity, in the Four
first Volumes of his History, or to the Sixth General Council.

In an APPENDIX will be given the ATHANASIAN
CREED, in GREEK, LATIN and ENGLISH, with a Short
Commentary, explaining the Difficulties of that celebrated
Production in such a manner, that all Persons of Ordinary
Capacity may readily conceive the Object of the Composer
throughout every Part of it. Its Age will also be attempted
to be pointed out.





